

UC-NRLF



B 2 628 207











Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation







FOREIGN  
DISSERTATION  
33935

EXCHANGE

B 2 628207

UC-NRLF



B 2 628 207

# THE KADDISH

INAUGURAL-DISSERTATION

ZUR

ERLANGUNG DER DOKTORWÜRDE

DER

HOHEN PHILOSOPHISCHEN FAKULTÄT DER RUPRECHT-  
KARLS-UNIVERSITÄT HEIDELBERG

VORGELEGT VON

DAVID DE SOLA POOL B. A.

AUS LONDON



DRUCK VON W. DRUGULIN IN LEIPZIG

1909





I, David de Sola Pool, son of Eleazar and Abigail Pool, born in London May 16, 1885, matriculated first class into London University in January 1902. I then entered, under the University of London, both Jews' College, London and University College, London for three years. In the former I studied under Drs. M. Friedländer, S. A. Hirsch, H. Hirschfeld and Mr. I. Abrahams, Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac and Arabic, and in the latter under Profs. Housman, Platt; Sully, Carveth Read; Brandin, Hartog; Gollancz and Hirschfeld, Classics, Philosophy, French and Hebrew, gaining inter alia the first year's Andrews scholarship in Classics 1903 and the Hollier Hebrew scholarship (divided) 1904. In 1903 I passed in Classics, French and Philosophy the Intermediate, and in 1905 the Final Bachelor of Arts examination in Hebrew and Aramaic, including Syriac, of the University of London, with First Class Honours and then entered Berlin University, hearing during three semesters Profs. Barth, Delitzsch, Gunkel, Pfeiderer, Riehl, Sachau, Winckler and Dr. Mittwoch, and at the same time Prof. Berliner, Drs. Hoffmann and Wohlgemuth in the Rabbiner Seminar and Prof. Steinschneider and Dr. Elbogen. In April 1907 I entered Heidelberg University, there studying under Profs. Becker, Bezold, Hoops and Wolfrum.

To all my teachers I take this opportunity of expressing my grateful thanks.



TO  
MY PARENTS  
AND MY HONORED TEACHER  
DR. M. FRIEDLANDER.



## CONTENTS.

	Page
Preface (Bibliography, Text and Translation) . . . . .	VII
Historical Introduction . . . . .	1
Language and date of the Kaddish . . . . .	10
יתגדל . . . . .	26
יהא שמיא רבא . . . . .	43
יתברך . . . . .	54
תתקבל . . . . .	65
יהא שלמא . . . . .	69
עושה שלום . . . . .	75
לחדתא . . . . .	79
על ישראל . . . . .	89
תתכלי . . . . .	97
Appendix A. The Name קריש . . . . .	100
Appendix B. The K. as a mourner's prayer . . . . .	101
Appendix C. The K. in the Synagogue service . . . . .	107
Appendix D. The K. and the Paternoster . . . . .	111
Appendix E. Antiphonal recitation . . . . .	112
Appendix F. The so called "Burial Kaddish" . . . . .	115
Index . . . . .	118

---

## CORRECTION.

Page 3, line 1: read 2Chr 205 ff. for 2Chr 295 ff.

Page 73, line 15: read הרחמן for הרחם.

Page 62, line 11: read Targum for Tagum.

---





The following presents a literary and historical investigation into the origin, growth and language of the prayer called the Kaddish (קַדִּישׁ). It has been found necessary to take note of the eschatological views prevailing at the times of its composition, to determine with exactness the technical meaning and full connotation of many words, and their inner connection one with another. In this way alone can the original significance and real import of the words and sentences be effectively determined. For this purpose, parallels have been drawn mainly from the contemporary Rabbinic literature, the New Testament and apocalyptic works.

The ritualistic aspect of the prayer as found in the Codes of laws and Minhagim is here noticed only where application to different occasions through meanings later read into the words, and a living tradition of their pronunciation and of the construction of the sentences bear upon the interpretation of the text. For the rest, the most important liturgical facts connected with the prayer are collected briefly in an appendix (C, P. 107).

The numerous parallels adduced from the Targum, are designed not alone to confirm the identity of language and thought of the Kaddish with those of the Targumim, but also to help towards establishing the exact meaning of many of the terms, thus at the same time often adding something towards an appreciation of the spirit and terminology of the Targumim.

To guard against misconception, it should be premised that the term Messianic is, unless otherwise stated, used in the following pages not in the narrow sense of the days of the wars and reign of the Messiah as distinct from the following resurrection, last judgment and kingdom of God, but generally for the glorious future as opposed to the present and past.

I have to express a debt of deep gratitude to Dr. Gaster for kindly placing at my disposal a number of his unique manuscripts and rare texts.

I venture to believe that this investigation has cast new light upon several Old Testament questions such as the schematic construction of many of its later prayers; the composite linguistic character and several features of the style of the Book of Daniel, and many points in connection with the Psalms such as their doxologies, liturgical recitation and parallelism.

I hope too that it may contribute towards a fuller appreciation of the New Testament, by showing from a fresh point of view its Jewish background and framework, the Jewish coloring of much of its most characteristic phraseology, and especially by a consideration of the form and origin of the Paternoster, the twin sister of the Kaddish.

In conclusion, I trust that this essay will commend itself to others beside the philologist and the student of the Bible, by adding a new chapter to the obscure subject of prayers for the dead, and by opening up a neglected province in the domain of the earliest Jewish liturgy.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The following are the chief works consulted in preparation of this essay:

- I. *On the Kaddish*: Landshuth בקור חולים P. LIX et seq. (useful).  
S. Baer עבודת ישראל P. 129f., 153, 588.  
Jewish Encyclopaedia and Hamburger's Real Encyclopädie Art. Kaddish.
- Eleazar Zalman Srajewski קדיש לעולם. Jerusalem 1901—naïvely uncritical.
- II. *Mediaeval commentaries on the Kaddish*:  
"Rashi (Solomon Yizhaki)" 1040—1105. Pardes.  
Abraham b. Nathan ibn Yarhi (of Lunel) Toledo 1204. Ha-Manhig. Tefillah 25—28.  
MS. Commentary of Eleazar b. Yehuda of Worms c. 1217. Brit. Mus. Add. 27, 556. P. 19b et seq.

MS Commentary (Cabbalistic) by Jehuda Romani b. 1292, Biblioteca Laurenziana, Florence. § 1—53, 80—103. 124. 131—135. 140—147.

Zedekiah b. Abraham 13<sup>th</sup> cent. Rome. Shibbole ha-Leḳeṭ ed. Buber Chap. 8.

MS. Commentary of Pereš b. Isaac ha-Cohen 13<sup>th</sup> cent. Gaster Cod. Montefiore 53 P. 55a.

Aaron b. Jacob b. David ha-Cohen fl. 1300 Orḥoth Ḥayyim and its later redaction the Kol Bo.

David Abudarham of Seville d. 1340 ed. princ. Lisbon 1490. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Constantinople 1513.

### III. *Texts of the Kaddish:*

Siddur of Rab Amram Gaon c. 900.<sup>1</sup>

Siddur of Seadya Gaon 892—942 Dr. Gaster's collation.

Maḥzor Vitry of Simḥa of Vitry c. 1100.<sup>2</sup>

Text of the Kaddish of Maimonides 1140—1205. Yad ha-Ḥazaḳa 2. סדר תפלות כל השנה. Or. 2227, P. 18b. 19a. Cod. Gaster 173. Athias, edition Amsterdam.

Yemen Rite.<sup>3</sup>

Old English 1287. JQR IV.

Roman (Italian) Rite.<sup>4</sup>

Spanish Rite.<sup>5</sup> (Sefardic).

<sup>1</sup> Brit. Mus. Or. 1067 14/15<sup>th</sup> cent. Printed Warsaw 1865. סידור lit. arrangement—of prayers, a prayer manual.

<sup>2</sup> Brit. Mus. Add. 27200—27201. Published by the Mekize Nirdamim ed. Hurwitz Berlin 1890. סידור cf. סידור (originally the astronomical yearly cycle of festivals, fasts etc.) the collection of prayers for the whole year.

<sup>3</sup> Brit. Mus. Or. 1479 (1674), 1480 (17/18 cent), 2227 (1540), 2389 (1635), 2418 (1741), Gaster Cod. 4, 6, 243, 249, 321. 2 Chamizer MSS in Dalman's Die Worte Jesu Anhang 305f. 1 MS in Alexander Kohut's Manzur al Dhamâri's Hebrew Arabic Commentary on the Pentateuch, New York 1892, Report of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America p. XXXV. Printed edition with commentary ed. Yahya Salah, תכלאל Jerusalem 1894.

<sup>4</sup> Brit. Mus. Or. 2736 (1390). Add. 27,072 (1482), 26,957 (1269), 18,230 (15<sup>th</sup> cent.). Biblioteca Laurenziana, Florence II 16. II 52. MS Gaster. Printed edit. S. D. Luzatto, Livorno 1856. (References to this).

<sup>5</sup> Abudarham. Brit. Mus. Add. 26,954 (14<sup>th</sup> cent.). A 14<sup>th</sup> cent. Cod. Gaster. Ed. princ. Venice, Bomberg 1524 (a reprint of the real ed. princ. which is unknown). References to ed. Gaster, London 1901.



German Rite.<sup>6</sup> (Ashkenazic).

Romanian (Byzantine).<sup>7</sup>

Corfu.<sup>8</sup>

Carpentras (Avignon, Lille etc.)<sup>9</sup>

Cingalese-Cochin.<sup>10</sup>

Provençal.<sup>11</sup>

Persian<sup>12</sup>.

Chinese<sup>13</sup>.

#### IV. *General:*

The Talmud-Babylonian ed. Vilna 1895—97.

The Talmud-Palestinian ed. Krotoschin 1866.

Massecheth Soferim ed. Müller 1878.

Tosefta ed. Zuckerman 1880—82.

Targum-Onkelos Sabionetta 1557 ed. Berliner 1884.

Targum Jerusalem I and II to Pentateuch ed. Ginsburger.

Targum to Prophets Cod. Reuchlin ed. Lagarde 1872.

Targum to Hagiographa ed. Lagarde 1873.

Midrash Rabba ed. Vilna 1878.

Sifre ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1864.

Mechilta ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1870.

Pesikta Rabbathi ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1880.

Pesikta ed. Buber, Lemberg 1868.

#### *The principal abbreviations employed are:*

A. Z. Aboda Zara.

B. Babylonian (Talmud).

b. ben.

<sup>6</sup> Brit. Mus. Or. 5866 (14<sup>th</sup> cent.) Or. 26,954, 27,086 (14<sup>th</sup> cent.), 27,556 (13/14<sup>th</sup> cent.). References to S. Baer. Rödelheim 1868.

<sup>7</sup> Brit. Mus. Harl. 5583. Cod. Gaster 157.

<sup>8</sup> Cod. Gaster 155.

<sup>9</sup> Brit. Mus. Add. 19667 (? 14<sup>th</sup> cent.) Cod. Gaster 166 (1750) Lille Cod. Gaster 164 (1804). Printed, Amsterdam 1739.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. princ. Amsterdam 1757.

<sup>11</sup> Cod. Gaster 701 (14<sup>th</sup> cent.).

<sup>12</sup> MSS. belonging to Mr. Elkan N. Adler, London.

<sup>13</sup> MSS. in the possession of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews.

- B. B. Baba Bathra.  
 B. K. Baba Kamma.  
 B. M. Baba Mešia.  
 D. Gr. Dalman, Grammatik des Jüdisch Palästinischen Aramäisch.  
 2. Auflage Leipz. 1905.  
 D. S. Diḳduke Soferim of RabbinoVICZ (Raph.) 1868—88.  
 D. W. J. Dalman, G., Die Worte Jesu.  
 E. S. Etymologische Studien (Barth).  
 E. T. A., E. T. T. Bacher, Exegetische Terminologie der Amoräer,  
 ... der Tannaiten.  
 G. D. K. Gedenkbuch für David Kaufmann 1899.  
 G. V. Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, L. Zunz.  
 Jell. B. H. Jellinek Ad., Beth Ha-Midrash 1853—78.  
 J. Jerusalem (Talmud).  
 J I and J II. Pseudo-Jonathan and Fragment Targum to the  
 Pentateuch.  
 J. Q. R. Jewish Quarterly Review, London.  
 Ldzb. Lidzbarski, M., Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik.  
 M. G. W. J. Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des  
 Judentums. Breslau.  
 M. K. Mo'ed Kaṭon.  
 N. B. Nominal-Bildung (Barth).  
 N. H. W. B. Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch (Levy, Jacob) 1876—89.  
 Onk. Targum Onkelos ed. Sabionetta.  
 P. R. El. Pirke de Rabbi Eleazar.  
 R. (before names) Rab, Rabbi, Rabban, Rabbenu.  
 R. É. J. Révue des Études Juives. Paris.  
 R. H. Rosh ha-Shana.  
 Schür. G. J. V. Schürer Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeit-  
 alter Jesu Christi. 3. Aufl. 1898.  
 T. B. E. R. Tanna de Be Eliahu Rabba }  
 T. B. E. Z. Tanna de Be Eliahu Zuṭṭa } ed. Friedmann 1900.  
 T. Tosefta, ed. Zuckermann 1880—82.  
 T. W. B. Targum Wörterbuch (Levy, Jacob) 1867—68.  
 Z. D. M. G. Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesell-  
 schaft.  
 הקדוש ברוך הוא = הקב"ה.

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION.

The full texts of the Kaddish with the variations in reading are given at the head of each section. But for the sake of convenience in reference, the oldest version as far as it is known to us from Amram's text is here appended:

יתגדל ויתקדש שמה רבא בעלמא דברא כרעותה וימלך מלכותה בחייו  
וביומיו ובחיי דכל בית ישראל בעגלא ובזמן קריב אמן. יהא שמה רבא מברך  
לעלם ולעלמי עלמא יתברך אמן. וישתבח ויתפאר ויתלמס ויתנשא ויתהדר  
ויתעלה ויתקלם שמה דקדשא בריך הוא לעלא מכל ברכתא שירתא תשבחתא  
ונחמתא דאמירן בעלמא ואמרו אמן.

תתקבל צלותהון ובעותהון דכל ישראל קדם אבוהון דבשמיא ואמרו אמן.  
יהא שלמא רבא מן שמיא וחיים [ושבע וישועה ונחמה והצלה לכל] (על כל)  
ישראל ואמרו אמן.

עושה שלום במרומיו הוא יעשה שלום על כל ישראל.  
יתגדל ויתקדש שמה רבא בעלמא דהוא עתיד לחדתא ולאחאה מתיא ולמבני  
קרתא דירושלם ולשכללא היכלא ולמעקר פלחנא נוכראה מארעה ולאחבא פלחנא  
קדישא דשמיא לאתרה וימלך קודשא בריך הוא מלכותה ויקרה בחייו וביומיו  
ובחיי דכל בית ישראל בעגלא ובזמן קריב אמן.

See further pp. 89 and 97 for two paragraphs not occurring in Amram.

The following translation<sup>1</sup> includes the most important features of all the texts:

(P. 26.) May He, according to His Will, reveal in the world which He has created, the greatness and holiness of His Great Name, and His sovereignty [make His redemption spring forth, cause His Messiah to approach and redeem His people (and build up His temple)] in your lifetime and in your days and in the lifetime of the whole house of Israel, speedily and at a near time (and say ye) Amen.

(P. 43.) Be His Great Name praised for ever and for all eternity.

(P. 54.) The Name of the Holy One, praised be He, be blessed, praised, honored, magnified, exalted, glorified, extolled and lauded

<sup>1</sup> The translation aims at expressing as exactly as possible the meaning of each word and of the construction. The disastrous effects on the English style must therefore be condoned.



far above all blessings, hymns, praises and glorifying consolations that can be uttered in the world (and say ye) Amen.

(P. 65.) May the prayer and supplication of the whole (house) of Israel be accepted by the(ir) Father who is in heaven (and say ye) Amen.

(P. 69.) May abundant peace from Heaven [with life, plenty salvation, comfort, liberation, health, redemption, forgiveness and expiation, enlargement and deliverance] be for us and for all Israel (and say ye) Amen.

(P. 75.) May He who maketh peace in His high places (in His mercy) make peace subsist upon us and upon all Israel (and say ye) Amen.

(P. 79.) May there be revealed the greatness and holiness of His great Name in the world that He will renew, and in which he will quicken the dead (and raise them up to life eternal) [and save the living], rebuild the city of Jerusalem, build up the (holy) temple (in the midst thereof), uproot false worship from (His land) (the earth), and restore the holy worship of (His Name) (the true God) to its place [(in) (to) its beauty and splendor and glory], and may (the Holy One, praised be) He reveal his sovereignty (and glory), and cause His redemption to spring forth, and hasten (the consummation of the kingdom of) His Messiah (and redeem His people) in your lifetime and in your days and in the lifetime of the whole house of Israel (now) speedily and at a near time (and say ye) Amen.

(P. 89.) Unto Israel and the Rabbis, their disciples and (all) the pupils of their disciples, (and all) who engage in the study of the (holy) law in this and in every other place, may there be (abundant peace) grace, favor and mercy [long life and (bounteous) sustenance] [(both) to them (and to [us] [you])] from the Lord of heaven and earth (and say ye) Amen.

(P. 97.) May the sword, famine, pestilence and evil diseases be withheld (and may He remove them) from us (and from you) and (all) His people (of the house of) Israel (and say ye) Amen.

---



## HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

There is no evidence of a fixed ritual in the Old Testament. Private prayers occur in it in abundance and there are also many references to public prayer, even to their having become conventional rote by the 8th cent.<sup>1</sup> But it was not until the destruction of the Temple 586 B. C. and the consequent cessation of the sacrificial services that the first great impetus to the development of the synagogue and its liturgy was given. The synagogue probably arose in the Babylonian exile, called into being as a substitute for the Temple worship in Jerusalem. After the return from exile and more especially under Ezra's influence, public prayer meetings became a regular institution, and synagogues soon sprang up in all Jewish settlements.

Tradition ascribes the foundation of the Jewish liturgy to the Men of the Great Synod אנשי כנסת הגדולה תקנו להם ברכות ותפלות (Ber. 33a); and the numerous prayers in the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles and Daniel, besides the probability that the foundations of the chief blessings (ברכות) e. g. those of the Shema' (שמע),<sup>2</sup> and prayers (תפלות) e. g. the Shemone 'Esre (שמנה עשרה)<sup>3</sup> go back to pre-Maccabean times, would support this tradition.

---

<sup>1</sup> Isa 29 13. Cf. ib. 1 15 58 5.

<sup>2</sup> The Shema', named from its opening verse Deut 6 4, is composed of the paragraphs Deut 6 4—9 11 13—21 Num 15 37—41. See SCHÜRER, *GJV.* 2 537 f. Dr. I. ELBOGEN, *JQR.* XIX 1907 p. 229 et seq.

<sup>3</sup> The 18 benedictions. Text: GASTER 30 et seq. BAER 87 et seq. Roman 15b et seq. etc. DALM., *WJ.* 299—304 gives both Palestinian and Babylonian versions. Translated by SCHÜRER, *GJV.* 2 538 ff. See Dr. I. ELBOGEN, *Geschichte des Achtzehngebetes*, *MGWJ.* 46 pp. 330—357 427—439 513—530.



*The discovery of a fixed scheme of construction of the opening of prayers in the Biblical books just mentioned* certainly points to a stereotyped form at the time of the Men of the Great Synod. On comparing the prayers in these books with the LXX prayer of Mordecai (Est 4 17), of Manasseh, of Tobias and the intimately related Shemone 'Esre, the following scheme becomes clear. In full it is as follows:

[(1) Historical introduction].

(2) The address to God, usually as God of the fathers,<sup>4</sup>

(3) An ascription of might (גבורה) to Him,<sup>5</sup>

(4) The Lord of heaven (and earth),<sup>6</sup>

(5) The King of kings.<sup>7</sup>

(6) The personal prayer, sometimes introduced by a further ascription to God of the particular quality or virtue prayed for and a general praise. For instance, on comparing Daniel 2 20—23a, 1 Chr 29 10—13 and 2 Chr 20 5—7 the variations of form within the scheme are amply accounted for by the difference in character between Daniel's supplication for wisdom, David's thanks for bounty and Jehoshaphat's prayer for strength (hence 3 is displaced in it).

C. 2 Chr 20 5ff.	B. Dan 2 19—23	A. 1 Chr 29 10—13
ויעמד יהושפט . . . ויאמר	אדין דניאל ברך לאלה	(1) ויברך דוד את ה' לעיני
	שמיא ענה דניאל ואמר	כל הקהל ויאמר דוד
ה' אלהי אבותינו	להוא שמה די אלהא מברך	(2) ברוך אתה ה' אלהי
	מן עלמא ועד עלמא	ישראל אבינו מעולם
		ועד עולם
[ובידך כח וגבורה ואין עמך	די חכמתא וגבורתא די	(3) לך ה' הגדלה והנבורה
להתיצב]	לה היא	והתפארת והנצח וההוד
הלא אתה הוא אלהים	והוא מהשנא עדניא וזמניא	(4) כי כל בשמים ובארץ
בשמים		
ואתה מושל בכל ממלכות	מהעדה מלכין ומהקים	(5) לך ה' הממלכה
הגוים	מלכין	

<sup>4</sup> 1 K 8 23 1 Chr 29 10 2 Chr 6 14 20 6 Neh 9 5 15. Prayer of Manasseh. Tobit 85. Cf. 1 Kgs 18 36.

<sup>5</sup> 1 K 8 23 1 Chr 29 11a 2 Chr 6 14 20 6 Dan 2 20c 94 Neh 15. Prayer of Mordecai 2, of Manasseh. Cf. Jer 32 17.

<sup>6</sup> 1 K 8 23 1 Chr 29 11b 2 Chr 6 14 20 6 Neh 15 96 [Dan 2 21a]. Prayer of Mordecai 3, of Manasseh, of Tobias. Cf. Jer 32 17 2 K 19 15.

<sup>7</sup> 1 Chr 29 11c 2 Chr 20 6 Dan 2 21b. Prayer of Mordecai 4. Cf. 2 K 19 15.

C. 2 Chr 29 5ff.	B. Dan 2 19—23	A. 1 Chr 29 10—13
הלא אתה . . . . ותושיע	יהב חכמתא . . . שרא	(6) והמתנשא . . . . לכל (Cf. C 5 and 3)
	לך אלה אבהתי מהודא ומשבח אנה	ועתה אלהינו מודים אנחנו לך ומהללים לשם תפארתך
ועתה הנה . . . .	וכען הודעתני . . . .	וכי מי אני . . . .

In the Prayer of Mordecai (2) is missing. Shorter, but of similar character are the other prayers. For example:

1 K 8 23 = 2 Chr 6 14	Neh 1 5	Dan 9 4
ויאמר	ומתפלל לפני אלהי השמים	(1) ואתפללה לה' אלהי
	ואמר	ואתורה ואמרה
ה' אלהי ישראל	אנא ה' (4) אלהי השמים	(2) אנא אדני
אין כמוך אלהים	האל הגדול והנורא	(3) האל הגדול והנורא
בשמים ממעל ועל הארץ	See (2)	(4)
מתחת		
שמר הברית והחסד לעבדיך	שמר הברית וחסד לאהביו	(6) שמר הברית והחסד
ההלכים לפניך בכל לבם.	ולשמרי מצותיו.	לאהביו ולשמרי מצותיו.
...ועתה... שמר לעבדך...	תהי נא אזנך . . .	חטאנו . . .

Of the Shemone 'Esre, in all probability founded by the Men of the Great Synod, and finally edited under Rabban Gamliel II, we have as original elements of the scheme, perhaps in part expanded:

- (2) ברוך אתה ה' אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו אלהי אברהם אלהי יצחק ואלהי יעקב  
 (3) האל הגדול הנבור והנורא<sup>8</sup> . . . [ואין כמוך חזק] . . . אתה נבור לעולם ה' . . . מי כמוך בעל גבורות . . .  
 (4) אל עליון [קונה שמים וארץ] (Pal. [Gen 14 19 22])  
 (5) וקונה הכל מלך

In general the first three blessings of the Shemone 'Esre are called אבות (= 2), גבורות (= 3, 4, 5) and קדושות (= 6).<sup>9</sup>

*We see here forms of blessing and prayer becoming fixed and traditional after the return from the Exile.*

<sup>8</sup> Ber 33b<sub>12</sub> Meg 25a<sup>21</sup> Yoma 69b<sub>16</sub> J. Ber 9i 12d<sub>31</sub>. Sifre 343 p. 142b Midr. Ps 19 2 p. 163. Deut 10 17 Neh 9 32.

<sup>9</sup> RH. 45 ELBOGEN, *MGWJ.* 46 pp. 515—519.

A fresh impetus to the development of the synagogue and its liturgy was the strong feeling and stirring activity of the Maccabean revival and the growth of the different parties in the state. The creation of the modern synagogue<sup>10</sup> with its rich ritual was effected by the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem and the Jewish state by Titus, and by the diaspora. The second Temple had had its sacrificial services and its worship, the service being of a very simple character, consisting mostly of Psalms<sup>11</sup> and other Biblical passages.<sup>12</sup> But the Temple had strongly influenced the synagogue service. Tradition has it that prayers were instituted corresponding with the continual offerings תמידים תקנום Ber 26 b<sup>14</sup>. This connection is also indicated by the turning towards the Temple in prayer;<sup>13</sup> so that when the Temple was destroyed, the synagogue service (עבודה Aboth 1 2) entirely replaced and usurped the importance of the Temple worship and its sacrificial services: גדולה תפלה יותר Ber 32 b<sup>7</sup>. The times of prayer were the times of sacrifice.<sup>14</sup> The Targum very commonly paraphrases expressions of sacrifice by those of prayer.

In these circumstances, Cant 5 2 was homiletically explained אני ישנה I am sleeping—from sacrifice, ולבי ער but my heart is awake—for prayer. Again, I am sleeping—from the Temple, but my heart is awake—for the synagogues and study houses: לבתי כנסיות ובתי מדרשות (Cant. Rab ib. p. 30 a). For inseparably bound up with the service of the synagogue had always been the service of the study

<sup>10</sup> Biblical are מועדי אל Ps 74 8 cf. Aquila, בית תפלה Isa 56 7 LXX 60 7. Cf. Acts 16 13 16 Pesh. bēth ṣelūthā. With בית מועד Job 30 23 compare Aboth 1 4 בית ועד. The usual later designation is הכנסת (בית) כנישתא, in Amos 5 12 15 the Targum translation of שער כנישתא in the Targum is the equivalent of עדה, in the Greek ἡ σύνοδος. Cf. Aboth 4 11 קְנִיָּה. In Gitt 39 b<sup>11</sup> is a mixed form תפלה בי. The popular designation בית עם (Jer 39 8 העם בית) is condemned by R. Simon b. Eleazar (2nd cent.).

<sup>11</sup> Ps 92 1 and the similar LXX titles to Ps 24 29 48 93 94 and Vulgate to 81. Hallel 113—118. Mishna Tamid 7 4 Mass. Soferim 18 1—3. The Psalm was known as פָּקֶק BACHER, *ETT*. 154 *ETA*. 163 f.

<sup>12</sup> The priestly blessing Num 6 22—27 Lev 5 5 16 21 Deut 26 3 ff. 13 ff. Mishna Tamid 5 1.

<sup>13</sup> Dan 6 11 1 Kgs 8 38 42 44 48 = 2 Chr 6 29 32 34 38 Ber 4 5. III Esdras 4 58. Perhaps also Ps 5 8 28 2 134 2.

<sup>14</sup> Dan 9 21 Ezr 9 5 Ps 141 2 Acts 3 1 10 2—4 9 30 Koran 30 16 f.



house or lecture room **בית המדרש**, **בית מדרשא**, **בית מדרשא**.<sup>15</sup> J. Meg 3 1, 73 d 32, J. Keth 13 1, 35 c 15 tell that attached to every one of the 480 synagogues in Jerusalem were two schools **בית ספר למקרא ובית תלמוד** **למשנה** one for Bible study and one for the traditional lore. The public reading and explanation of the Torah on Sabbaths and Festivals was to Philo<sup>16</sup>, Josephus<sup>17</sup>, the Apostle James<sup>18</sup> and the Rabbis<sup>19</sup> so primitive an institution that its origin is ascribed to Moses; and its reading on the two market days, Monday and Thursday, when the villagers collected in the towns, and on Sabbath afternoons, a time of general leisure, is ascribed to Ezra.<sup>20</sup> The book of Deuteronomy read in the 7th year (Deut 31 10—13) is a connected address of the lawgiver (ZUNZ *G. V.* 3). Jer 17 19—27 is a Sabbath sermon. In Jer 36 4—13 Jeremiah dictates to Baruch an exhortation to the people to be delivered on the coming fast, in the house of the Lord (**בית ה'**). 2 K 4 23, Isa 1 12 ff., 66 23 imply special gatherings for prayer and instruction from the Prophet on New Moons and Sabbaths. In many passages in Nehemiah<sup>21</sup> we hear of gatherings in which the people were instructed in the Law. The reading of a portion from the Torah (**פרשה**, **פרשתא**)<sup>22</sup> soon became the central part of the synagogue service, and the highest importance was attached to its study and exposition in the **בית המדרש**.<sup>23</sup> Shema'ya and Abtalyon, heads of the Sanhedrin 60—35 B. C. are called **דרשנים**—interpreters, expositors, preachers (Pes 70 b 13).<sup>24</sup> In Hillel's

<sup>15</sup> **בית מדרשא** occurs in Sirach 51 23. For **בית מדרשא** sometimes occurs **מדרשא** alone, LEVY *TWB.* II 12b. The public lecture of general instruction was called **פרקא** BACHER, *ETA.* 164.

<sup>16</sup> De Opificio Mundi. De Septennario 6.

<sup>17</sup> Contra Ap. 2 18 and Antiq. 16 2 4.

<sup>18</sup> Acts 15 21.

<sup>19</sup> J. Meg. 4 1 75a <sup>19</sup> BK. 82a <sup>18</sup> Soferim 10 1 p. 143 f. Yalkut I 408 to **יקהל** beginning. Mech. בשלה 18b.

<sup>20</sup> J. Meg. 4 1 75a <sup>21</sup> BK. 82a 9 17 Soferim 10 2.

<sup>21</sup> Neh 8 1—9 13 ff. 18 13 1—3 9 3.

<sup>22</sup> The **פרשה** or **פר** is the regular weekly section. The **פרשה**, pl. **פרשיות**, Aram. **פרשתא** is the weekly section or more generally any section. But see BACHER, *ETT.* 130 f. 160 ff., *ETA.* 133 ff. 169 f.

<sup>23</sup> Compare the application of Prov 28 9 in Shab 10a <sup>17</sup> and Philo's opinion quoted by SCHÜR., *GJV.* 2 527. On the meaning of **דרש** see LEVY, *NHWB.*, SCHÜR., *GJV.* 2 392, BACHER, *ETT.* 25 f. *ETA.* 41 f.

<sup>24</sup> Ben Zoma was also a famous **דרשן**; so much so, that it was said of him (Sota 9 15) **משמת במלו הדרשנים**. Further BACHER, *ETT.* 27.

time, this public exposition—מדרש was usual everywhere<sup>25</sup> and the Acts of the Apostles shows us a like custom in Ephesus, Athens, Damascus, Corinth etc.<sup>26</sup> In fact everywhere throughout the diaspora the custom of studying the law and the prophets and expounding them on Sabbaths and Festivals was the same. ילכו מחיל אל חיל (Ps 84 8) 'they go from strength to strength' is applied to those who go from the synagogue to the study house<sup>27</sup> to hear the הלכה<sup>28</sup> legal study, or the הנהגה,<sup>29</sup> homiletic, didactic teaching freely developed from a Scriptural text.

These Aggadic discourses were held regularly on Sabbaths<sup>30</sup> and Festivals and often every morning.<sup>31</sup> When a selection from the Prophets was read, the Aggada usually started from it<sup>32</sup> and seized upon its Messianic features for elaboration. The Targumim are witness how a Messianic coloring was given to the text on every possible opportunity. In times of unparalleled hardship, best exemplified by the Hadrianic persecutions, the people turned to the Aggada for hope and consolation. Even Halachic study usually closed with hopeful Aggada<sup>33</sup>; and the principle of closing with auspicious words,—a דבר טוב (J. Meg 3 8, 74b<sup>25</sup>) plays an important rôle even in the minutely prosaic Masora, where the division of the paragraphs often seems to be influenced by it, just

<sup>25</sup> Matth 4 23 = 9 35 13 54 Mark 1 21 39 62 Luke 4 15 et seq. 32 44 66 13 10 John 6 59 18 20.

<sup>26</sup> Acts 13 14 f. 49 9 20 14 1 13 5 18 19 26 4 19 8 17 17 10 1—3 1 Cor 14 27 f.

<sup>27</sup> Targ. ib. Ber 9 end 64a MK. 3 end 29a.

<sup>28</sup> See BACHER, *ETT.* 42, *ETA.* 53 ff.

<sup>29</sup> BACHER, *JQR.* IV 406—429. *ETT.* 33 ff., *ETA.* 44. The form "Aggada" used in this essay, does not actually occur, אגדתא being the regular Aramaic term. The form 'Aggada' is used to distinguish it from Haggada in the specialized meaning "the service of the Passover eve."

<sup>30</sup> Acts 13 14 27 42 44 J. Sota 14 16d<sub>31</sub> R. MEIR lectured כל ילי שבת.

<sup>31</sup> Kol Bo § 14 שחרית בכל שחרית ובראשית. The fragmentary remains of the Targum paraphrase in the prayer ובראשית point in the same direction.

<sup>32</sup> Luke 4 16 et seq. Acts 13 14—16 27 and in the early Church the sermon regularly followed the Bible reading. G. KLEIN in the *Zeitschrift f. d. neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* .. VII, 1906 traces the whole of the Paternoster back to Ezek 36 23—31. Compare the construction of the Pesikta Midrashim.

<sup>33</sup> Mishna Ber., Peah, Yoma, Sota, Macc., Eduy., Menach., Hull., Tamid. MK. 3 9 and Taan 4 8 are hopeful Messianic seals to tractates dealing with sinister subjects.



as the repetition of the penultimate verses of Isaiah, Malachi, Lamentations and Ecclesiastes is due to the same influence (Sofferim 12 2 p. 161).

The discourse (פְּתִיחָה, פְּתָחָה or פְּתָחָה, divided into (1) פְּתָחָה or פְּתָחָה, (2) דְּרָשָׁה the exposition itself and (3) אַפְסָרְתָּה<sup>34</sup> the resumé and conclusion, especially in the אַפְסָרְתָּה, was characterised by words of comfort from the Messianic promise, somewhat similarly to the prayer that followed the sermon in the early church. This conclusion, in nature related to the blessing following the reading of the Torah (Meg 4 2) or its study (Ber 11 b<sub>26</sub>), being usually a Messianic praise or prayer of more or less fixed form, served at the same time as a sign of the close of the address. In Levit. Rab. for instance, 25 out of the 37 chapters end with a Messianic passage and 3 with a prayer (ZUNZ, *G. V.* 191/2). The name אַפְסָרְתָּה, הפְּסָרָה, as "missa", means the dismissal formula,<sup>35</sup> and particular homilists (דְּרָשָׁה, דְּרָשָׁה, דְּרָשָׁה, דְּרָשָׁה)<sup>37</sup> seem to have had formulae which in the course of time became crystallized into fixed forms: e. g. the Meturgeman of R. Yudan always closed his words with the same prayer: יְהִי רָצוֹן . . . שְׁתֵּתֵן בְּלִבֵּנוּ לַעֲשׂוֹת תְּשׁוּבָה . . . ר' יוֹדֵן בִּי (J. Ber 4 2, 7d<sub>16</sub>). רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל קָבַע לֵיהּ לְאִמּוּרִיהּ<sup>38</sup> דִּימַר בְּתַר פְּרִשְׁתָּא כֵּן

<sup>34</sup> The regular phrase for beginning a homiletic discourse or address is ר' בְּרַבְרִי or בְּרַבְרִי. פְּתָחָה with an understood object such as פְּתָחָה or פְּתָחָה (Ps 119 130) was later sometimes replaced by פְּתָחָה פִּי. BACHER, *ETT.* 162 f. *ETA.* 174 ff.

<sup>35</sup> BACHER, *ETA.* 15 denies that אַפְסָרְתָּה bears this meaning. According to him אַפְסָרְתָּה is a whole parting address. The early Tannaitic term for closing a discourse is חֲתִימָה, the conclusion being called the חֲתִימָה. The later term found in the Babylonian Talmud is קִיּוּמָה. BACHER, *ETT.* 65, *ETA.* 69 137 f. חֲתִימָה is the concluding formula in prayer. הַשְׁלִים is also used of closing a Midrashic address BACHER, *ETA.* 58, LEVY, *NHWP.* gives קִיּוּמָה, *BB.* 22a in the sense of the close of a lecture.

<sup>36</sup> 2 Chr 23 8. Compare the common use of מַפְסֵר for parting, —כִּי הוּא מַפְסֵר מִ— Ber 17a<sub>63</sub> Taan 5b<sub>7</sub> Yoma 71a<sub>9</sub> Ber 64a<sub>16</sub> Exod 18 27 J.I. Further LEVY, *NHWP.* ZUNZ, *G. V.* 367/9. Ber 4 2 gives a prayer of R. Nehunya b. ha Kana on leaving the מדרש.

<sup>37</sup> דְּרָשָׁה BACHER, *ETT.* 27, דְּרָשָׁה ib. 28, דְּרָשָׁה *ETA.* 43 where it is pointed out that דְּרָשָׁה occurs as plural of דְּרָשָׁה, and the plural דְּרָשָׁה occurs in this meaning, pointing to a sing. דְּרָשָׁה.

<sup>38</sup> אִמּוּרָה a synonym of מְתוּרְגְּמָנָה (מְתוּרְגְּמָן) Babyl. or מְתוּרְגְּמָנָה Palest. Rashi on Yoma 20b, Pes 50b<sub>12</sub> Hag 14a<sub>16</sub> Meg 23b<sub>1</sub> 24a<sub>4</sub> MK. 21a<sub>17</sub> Keth 8b<sub>16</sub> Sota 37b<sub>25</sub>

One such doxology that came into regular use is the first paragraph of the Kaddish with the response of the congregation, forming the original Kaddish, the Kaddish proper (ZUNZ, *G. V.* 372/85).

The Kaddish is in origin a closing doxology to an Aggadic discourse, as is clear from the following passages:

(A)<sup>39</sup> עלמא אמאי קא מקיים? אקדושא דסידרא ואיהא שמיה רבא דאגרתא. Raba (320—375) asks "Upon what does the world rest? On the קדושא דסדרא and the response 'ש' 'ר' of the Aggada", i. e. on the Torah study of the תלמידי חכמים, the learned in the law, and the Aggadic instruction of the people (HERZFELD, *Gesch. des Volkes Isr.* 2 206).

(B)<sup>40</sup> A heavenly echo (בת קול) cries out from a ruin to R. Jose b. Halafta (2nd cent.) in comfort for the Hadrianic persecution בשעה שישראל עושין רצונו של מקום ונכנסין לבתי כנסיות ולבתי מדרשות ועונין יהא שמיה רבא מברך הקדוש ברוך הוא מנענע ראשו ואומר . . אשרי ישר"ם. "When Israel perform the will of Heaven by gathering in the synagogues and study houses and respond ישר"ם, the Holy One, blessed be He, shakes His head and says . . . 'Happy is the King to Whom such praises are offered in His house.'"

(C)<sup>41</sup> According to R. Ishmael, God is truly glorified in his world בשעה שישראל נאספין בבתי מדרשות ושומעין אנדה מפי חכם ואחר חכם. "When Israel assemble in the

Kid 31b<sub>7</sub> Hul 142a<sub>2</sub> Sanh 7b<sup>21</sup>. On the forms (for 'מתר' and 'תרנ') BARTH, *NB.* § 190d, note 2, p. 310. BACHER (*Die älteste Terminologie der jüd. Schriftauslegung*) *ETT.* p. 206 note 2.

<sup>39</sup> Sota 49a<sub>26</sub>. The קדושא—Isa 63 Ezek 312 Exod 1518 = Ps 14610 of the סדרא, study house, lecture room, is embodied in the prayer לציון connected with the study at the end of the service. The occurrence of Exod 1518 instead of Ps 14610 points to the time before the existence of a Targum to the Psalms that could be drawn upon as official and generally recognised.

<sup>40</sup> Ber 3a<sub>5</sub> the text according to Dikduke Soferim. All the old texts read the pure Aramaic form יהא שמיה רבא מברך, Amram the full response including יתברך. But Abudarham found the Hebrew text in old and correct copies (נוסחאות ישנות ומדויקות). The mixed reading of the editions הגדול מבורך יהא שמו dates from Solomon Luria (1534—72). Shibbole ha-Leḳeṭ (ed. BUBER) quotes יהא שמו הגדול מבורך. Samuel Edels (1555—1631) corrects the reading of the editions to יהא שמו הגדול מבורך. יהא is often used in Hebrew texts.

<sup>41</sup> Midr. Prov. to 1428 ed. BUBER p. 75. Yalkut II to Prov. ib. 951. Cf. Yalk. I 408 beg. ויקהל. Amram I 12b.

study houses to hear the Aggada from a preacher and respond afterwards *אשר"מ*.

(D)<sup>42</sup> שבשעה שהוקן יושב ודורש ועונן אחריו אמן יהי שמו הגדול מבורך. "When the preacher expounds God's word and they respond after him אפילו יש לו שטר גזירות של מאה שנה הקב"ה מוחל על כל עונותיו *אשר"מ*, even though punishment decrees of a hundred years should be standing against him, the Holy One, blessed be He, forgives him all his sins."

(E)<sup>43</sup> וכיון שמגיע לאגדה (עומד ורובבל read as Yalkut) שמיים ההגדה) עומד ורובבל. "בן שאלתיאל על רגליו ואומר יתגדל ויתקדש . . וכל באי עולם עונן אמן. "And when he closes his Aggadic address, Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel stands up and says . . . יתגדל ויתקדש to which they all answer Amen."

(F)<sup>44</sup> אומר דוד אגדה לפני הקב"ה ועונן אחריו הצדיקים אמן יהא שמה *אשר"מ*. "David holds an Aggadic discourse before the Holy One, blessed be He, and the righteous respond to it out of the garden of Eden with אמן מתוך גיהנם, and the transgressors of Israel answer Amen from Gehinnom."

(G)<sup>45</sup> At the election of the Exilarch (ריש גלותא) כשהוא גומר: "When he has completed his discourse ..., ... the Ḥazan stands and recites the Kaddish." [דרוש] מתחיל בבעיא ואומר ברם צריך את למילף. ועומד וקן אחד חכם ורגיל ומשיב כענין ויושב ועומד החזן ואומר קדיש

Collectively these passages leave no doubt that the Kaddish was a closing doxology to an Aggadic address, the final expression in prayer of the Messianic hope pictured by the preacher's words. A comparison of it with the language of Messianic passages in the Targum to the Prophets e. g. Mal 1 11 readily shows its unity in language and sentiment with the exposition that it sealed; and its intimate relationship with the formula closing the reading and Targum of the Haftarah<sup>46</sup> על דא יתברך ויתפאר שמה די אלהא רבא

<sup>42</sup> Midr. Eccl. to 9 14 f. p. 25c.

<sup>43</sup> Alphabet of R. Akiba 1st recension JELL., BH. III 27. Yalkut II 428 to Isa 26 2 in the name of Resh Lakish (3rd cent.).

<sup>44</sup> Pseudo TBEZ. 20 end = Pirke de R. Eleazar 2. JELL., BH. V 46. Amram I 13b.

<sup>45</sup> Sefer ha-Yuḥasin 123c of Abraham b. Samuel Zacuto 1504 describing the election of the Exilarch in Gaonic times.

<sup>46</sup> Roman rite p. 107b 115b etc. Maḥzor Vitry, Romanian rite, LAGARDE, Proph. Chald. p. 493, Rite of Fez, Genizah fragments etc. ZUNZ, Lit. Gesch. 79.



מלכנו and with other closing prayers e. g. וקדישא לעלם ולעלמי עלמין (Amram 9a), gives support from internal evidence to this identification of the Kaddish with the closing prayer of Aggadic lectures. The name קדיש, too, apparently means the holy part, the doxology as contrasted with the less sacred character of the preceding Aggada [Appendix A Page 100].

The Kaddish is still used in one form as a closing prayer. But it has also become, by a curious development, a mourner's prayer [Appendix B Page 101], and in its character of a liturgical doxology, a synagogue prayer with responses, recited at the close of different sections of the service [Appendix C Page 107].

Written prayer manuals began to supersede the older system of recitation by heart probably by the 7th century; and in the chief of these early written records of the liturgy, Massecheth Soferim, the Kaddish already holds an assured place in the synagogue service.

In the middle ages in Spain, and to some extent in France under Spanish influence, the great religious poets such as Yehuda ha-Levi, Abraham ibn Ezra, Isaac Giat embellished the Kaddish with sublime poetical introductions<sup>47</sup>; whereas the Cabbalists glorified it by weaving around it a vast web of mystic lore, and by searching out deep import even in the number of letters or words in the response or in the seven praises.<sup>48</sup> It has also been parodied.<sup>49</sup>

Thus the Kaddish has become in itself the three pillars upon which the world stands (Aboth 1 2): התורה as the doxology of the study house, העבודה as an integral part of the synagogue service and נמילות חסדים as the mourner's prayer for the dead.

## THE LANGUAGE AND DATE OF THE KADDISH.

The original paragraph of the Kaddish and its response are composed in Aramaic. The following words, however, from יתברך ויתהלל are Hebrew. The paragraph יהא שלמא in its present form

<sup>47</sup> ZUNZ, *Ritus and Lit. Gesch.* passim. Nachtrag 13 56 60. Kohut in *MGWJ.* 1893 XXXVIII 443 prints a poem from the מדרש הנדול that shows many influences from the Kaddish.

<sup>48</sup> E. g. in the commentary of the printed Yemenite prayer book תכלאל Jerusalem 1894. Peri Ez Hayyim of VITAL שער הקדיש.

<sup>49</sup> Dr. DAVIDSON, Parody in *Jewish Literature* pp. 147. 197. 199.

is a composite of Aramaic and Hebrew, and the closing verse עושה שלום is entirely Hebrew.

It is only natural that the doxology to a discourse held in the vernacular, should be also in the vernacular. In the lecture room, and synagogue as a lecture room, Aramaic largely held sway. In Greek, Latin or Persian speaking Jewish colonies, these local vernaculars naturally were used.<sup>1</sup> But with these languages we are not here concerned, as the Jews speaking them played little or no part in the development of Jewish tradition and synagogue institutions. The vernacular in question is Aramaic. Roughly speaking, during the millenium between the period of Ezra and the spread of Arabic through the conquests of Islam, it was the mother tongue of the Jews of Palestine, Syria and Babylon, who constituted not only the vast majority of Jewry, but that part which handed on and developed the traditions of Jewish learning and study.

Neglecting all other considerations, the linguistic character of the older Midrashim bears witness to this use of Aramaic in the lecture house. In the oldest Midrashim, Genesis Rabba, Leviticus Rabba, Lamentations Rabba, Canticles Rabba and the Pesikta's, the proportion of Aramaic to Hebrew is very large. It is very considerable also in Ruth Rabba, Esther Rabba, Ecclesiastes Rabba and Midrash Psalms. Many of the later Midrashim are to some extent Hebrew recensions of an earlier Aramaic text. Hence it is easily intelligible that the Kaddish as a doxology to a Midrashic address is in Aramaic. The tradition possessed by the Talmud glossators (Tosafists) of the 12th and 13th centuries noted by them on the passage B (Page 8 Ber 3a), rightly explains the language of the Kaddish in accordance with this fact.

In the synagogue the vernacular was also in use for the translation and study of the Torah. The section of the law and of the prophets that was read was translated or paraphrased, giving rise to the Aramaic תרגום, which in the time of the Mishna<sup>2</sup> was an

<sup>1</sup> Acts 14:1 17:12 18:4 1 Cor 1:23. SCHÜR., *GJV.* III 93ff. L. BLAU, *Zur Einleitung in die heilige Schrift.—Jahresbericht d. Landes-Rabbinerschule in Budapest* 1894, p. 84 et seq. esp. pp. 87ff. 97.

<sup>2</sup> Meg. 4:4 6:9 10 T. Meg. 4:20 f. 31—41 227:5 ff. On the form תרגום, NB. § 188c p. 302, BACHER, *ETT.* 204ff., *ETA.* 242ff., Assyrian ragāmū call about





old and firmly settled institution. The final redaction of the Targumim<sup>3</sup> is only the crystallization in writing of a late stage of a tradition that goes back many centuries earlier. For the origin of the custom of translating the Bible readings into the vernacular must be sought in the early times of the second Temple. In fact it may be assumed to have arisen as soon as the necessity arose for it.<sup>4</sup> The record of the dying words of Jesus, (Mark 15 34) Ἑλὼι ἑλὼι λεμὰ σαβαχθανεὶ indicate that the Bible was most familiar and came most readily to him in its Aramaic garb. In the synagogues at the beginning of the Christian era the use of a Targum was everywhere in vogue.<sup>5</sup> The necessity for this translation into the vernacular was the more urgent since in addition to the בור or מדין (ιδιώτης)<sup>6</sup> women and children formed a large part of the congregation. In some cases the Targum was added especially in their interest.<sup>7</sup>

Much of the old Aramaic of the Synagogue liturgy naturally grew up around the Aramaic paraphrase;<sup>8</sup> but in the domain of pure liturgy Aramaic prayers are by no means uncommon, even

cry. But see DELITZSCH, *Assyr. Lex.* 713 (from רגם) and MUSS-ARNOLT, *Assyr.-Engl.-Deutsches Handwörterbuch* p. 1191 f.

<sup>3</sup> Onkelos 3rd cent. Jonathan to the Prophets 4th cent. Pseudo Jonathan to the Pentateuch (J I, J II, J III) 7th—8th cent.

<sup>4</sup> Even though שְׁבַח Neh 8 8 is not a certain reference to the Targum as Rab 219—257 CE. (Meg 3a<sup>21</sup> Ned 37b<sup>14</sup> J. Meg 41 74d<sup>29</sup> Gen Rab 36 end) explains it, the antiquity of the custom of interrupting with a Targum is beyond all dispute.

<sup>5</sup> In Luke 4 16 et seq. no mention is made of a translation. But we need not assume the existence of an Aramaic roll from which the original reading was made as does ARNOLD MEYER, *Jesu Muttersprache* 57 f. The translation added to the verses read may be passed over as not needing special mention. Or the omission may be an inaccuracy in the account as given by the gentile Luke, who, be it noted, cites the verses in the form they take in the LXX. The authenticity of the whole passage is strongly attacked on internal and external grounds by KEIM, *Geschichte Jesu* II 18—22.

<sup>6</sup> Acts 4 13 ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοι, καὶ ἰδιῶται; Pesh. ܡܕܝܢܐ ܠܥܡܡܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ.

<sup>7</sup> Exod 38 8 Deut 31 12 I Sam 1 12 II K 4 23 Isa 3 16 32 9 Neh 8 3 Acts 16 13 Mass. Soferim 18 4. For other cases of women attending at the Beth ha-Midrash J. Sota 1 4 16d<sup>31</sup> = Lev. Rab 9 p. 13d. AZ. 38a<sup>1</sup> Sota 22a<sup>14</sup>. In Meg 23a<sup>8</sup> the question is raised whether women are allowed to read from the Torah in synagogue. Compare T. Meg 4 11 226 4 Yalkut I 871.

<sup>8</sup> E. g. in the Mahzor Vitry 158—173. ZUNZ, *Lit. Gesch.* 74—80.



when we leave out of consideration later compositions such as בריך taken from the Zohar to ויקהל, and the poetical pieces for special days excerpted from the Targum and Midrash.<sup>9</sup> For when Arabic became the vernacular, Aramaic became a second holy tongue, so much religious literature being composed in it. It is to some extent regarded as such at the present day, and among the Jews of Yemen the employment of the Targum is a living institution. Their prayer-book, also, contains a larger proportion of Aramaic than is found in other rituals.

When Arabic was the vernacular, Arabic prayers were included in the liturgy, e. g. in Seadya's Siddur. In the same way we have many old and originally Aramaic pieces in the prayer book. In the service of the priests of the second Temple, Aramaic was probably used, as Prof. Büchler has shown.<sup>10</sup> So too, in the later synagogue, in matters affecting the congregation [e. g. יקום פורקן (Page 90) the annulling of certain vows כל נדרי<sup>11</sup>], or the individual (e. g. מצלאין אנהנא<sup>12</sup>, מחי ומסי<sup>13</sup>, תשתלה אסותא<sup>14</sup> etc.) and of course in private prayer (e. g. the blessing of the shepherd Benjamin<sup>15</sup> בריך מריה<sup>16</sup>, דהאי פיתא, ἀββᾶ Mark 14 36), the vernacular was largely in use, especially in the old Babylonian rite.<sup>15</sup> The oldest supplicatory prayers—סליחות—are to a large extent Aramaic.<sup>16</sup> Hence it is not surprising to find that synagogue additions to the Kaddish—תתקבל and תתכלי—were made in Aramaic.

For the most part, and by preference however, the synagogue service was made up of Hebrew prayers, as Hebrew the לשון הקדש,

<sup>9</sup> ZUNZ, *Lit. Gesch.* 21f.

<sup>10</sup> Prof. ADOLF BÜCHLER, *Die Priester und Cultus* p. 60—67 and the criticism of S. KRAUSS, *JQR.* VIII 670.

<sup>11</sup> Maḥzor Vitry. p. 172 388 etc.

<sup>12</sup> Amr. I 52b. In the rite of Cochin p. 22b it is included in an elaboration of the Kaddish as follows: תשתלה אסותא רפואה דחיי ודרחמי מן קדם קודשא בריך הוא לאסאה יתכון ולרחקא עליכון ולכל מאן דצריך לאסותא דישאל ויפסי מן קדמוהי לחיים ולשלום ייחין שמעין טובין על מקדשא ועל תיקלא ועל אתרא This is followed by ולרפואה ואמרו אמן: קדישא ועל מלכות משיח בן דוד בעגלא ובזמן קריב וא"א.

<sup>13</sup> Amram II 21b.

<sup>14</sup> Ber 40b 22.

<sup>15</sup> ZUNZ, *Lit. Gesch.* 18f. *Nachtrag* 1.

<sup>16</sup> E. g. the litany רחמנא Amram II 19b 20a, מרן רבשמיא Amram II 21a, ענינן ib. 21a. —. . . ענינן

לשון<sup>17</sup> בית קורשא naturally took precedence over Aramaic, the לשון<sup>18</sup> חול לשון הדיוט,<sup>19</sup> the language of the ἰδιώτης, the unlearned. The permission given by the early authorities, recorded in the Mishna<sup>20</sup>, ברכת המזון תפלה קריאת שמע בכל לשון the grace after food, the Shemone 'Esre or the Shema' may be said in any language, did not always find favor. A certain R. Levi wished to prevent the reading of the Shema' in Greek in Caesarea,<sup>21</sup> and R. Yoḥanan (d. 279 C. E.) is of opinion that he who prays in Aramaic must dispense with the favoring help of the angels who do not understand Aramaic.<sup>22</sup> This idea that the angels do not understand Aramaic was generally taken up and applied in various ways during the middle ages to account for the Kaddish being in Aramaic<sup>23</sup> when the origin of the prayer and the cause of its being in the vernacular had become obscured. But the truer reason was not altogether forgotten, and permission was given to say the Kaddish in the language best understood if Aramaic was not understood.<sup>24</sup>

To be accurate, a distinction must be drawn between the vernacular and the language of the Kaddish. The vernacular, the Jewish Aramaic spoken by the people, preserved in the Talmuds and Midrashim in conversations, anecdotes, proverbs and popular parlance generally, whether Babylonian or Palestinian, is very different from the language of the Kaddish. The Kaddish, as the doxology to an Aggadic address, partakes linguistically of the peculiarities of the language used by the homilist. As the preacher's words were woven around Biblical verses, he spoke the לשון חכמים, the hebraizing language of a translation, an artificial, learned language, characterised by Hebraic phrases and constructions as much as is Aquila's Greek. Cleomedes mocks at the bad Greek spoken in the synagogues.<sup>25</sup> The

<sup>17</sup> Sota 7 2 4 Ber 40b 26 Shab 40b 11. לשון קורשא Gen 11 1 J I. 31 11 J II  
לשון בית קורשא Gen 31 47 J I, 45 12 J I 35 18 J II. <sup>18</sup> Ber. ib. Shab. ib.

<sup>19</sup> B. M. 104a 21 etc. of Hillel, R. Jehuda, R. Meir and R. Joshua b. Korḥa  
היה דורש לשון הדיוט. it is related

<sup>20</sup> Sota 7 1. Cf. Meg. 2 1 Sofer 18 4.

<sup>21</sup> J. Sota 7 1 21b 15.

<sup>22</sup> Sota 33a Shab 12b 12 R. Yoḥanan however warns against disparaging  
Aramaic J. Sota 7 2 21c 9.

<sup>23</sup> Maḥzor Vitry p. 54f. quoted by the Tosafoth (Scholiasts) to Ber 3a. Tur  
Orah Ḥayyim § 56. Orchoth Ḥayyim, ha Manhig, Abudarham, Rashi etc. etc.

<sup>24</sup> שאלות ותשובות דבר שמואל 321.

<sup>25</sup> SCHÜRER, *GJV*. III 95 note 18.

Aramaic of the synagogues was of the same nature, and it is in this hebraizing, literary, jargon Aramaic of the Targumim that the Kaddish is composed. It is as far removed from the popular Babylonian Jewish Aramaic as is the school language of Onkelos and of the Targum to the Prophets; and it is as unlike the North Palestinian (Galilean) popular language preserved in the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim as is the mixed Aramaic of the Jerusalem Targum. In Kid. 70a, the distinction is drawn between דאמרי רבנן and דאמרי אינשי.<sup>26</sup> *The Kaddish is composed in the school language of the Targum.* It is in grammar and vocabulary colorless enough to have been used harmoniously both in the East (Onkelos) and in the West (Jerusalem Targum); it is however more nearly akin to the language of the Targum to the Prophets (= Onkelos) than to any other dialect; and every word and phrase in it can be abundantly paralleled in the Babylonian Targumim.

As Christian Aramaic was influenced by Greek, Jewish Aramaic, even in the 5th century B. C.<sup>27</sup>, was influenced by Hebrew, and none more so than that of the Targum. The Kaddish, however, owing to the accident of its form, presents no occasion for the occurrence of hebraizing constructions characteristic of the Targum<sup>28</sup>, and shows its hebraizing character only in its vocabulary. In this, it, like the passages of the Aggada, varies between Aramaic and Hebrew.

This fragmentary interchange of languages is far from being of isolated occurrence in the oldest Jewish liturgical prayers. According to one authority, the high priest on the Day of Atonement prayed . . . לא יערי עביר שולטן מדבית יהודה ולא יהיו עמך ישראל צריכין לפרנסה.<sup>29</sup> In the ancient profession of faith following the recital of the Shema' there is a heaping of paired synonyms for the sake of emphasis, the synonyms being in three cases hebraizing and aramaizing

<sup>26</sup> A distinction is drawn between לשון (ה) תורה and לשון בני אדם in Jer. Erub 3 1 20d <sup>27</sup> Jer. Ned 6 1 39c <sup>32</sup> Jer. Shebu 7 1 37c 25, and between לשון תורה and לשון חכמים AZ. 58b <sup>14</sup> Hul 137b <sup>11</sup>.

<sup>27</sup> SAYCE-COWLEY, *Egyptian Papyri* p. 20, NÖLDEKE, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* XX ('07) p. 137.

<sup>28</sup> Enumerated DALMAN, *WJ.* 66.

<sup>29</sup> Yoma 53b <sup>21</sup>. The Aramaic is the Onkelos Targum to Gen 49 10. Compare the sayings in לשון הריים BM. 104a.



respectively<sup>30</sup> . . ואהוב וחביב . . . The prayer ענין דעני ל<sup>31</sup>, of the same form as that found in the ancient record of Taan 24 ענינו . . מי שענה . . is another case in point. Into this Aramaic framework is put sometimes a Hebrew, sometimes an Aramaic filling. The opening verses are entirely Aramaic. Then דעני לאברהם אבינו בהר המוריה ענין (also in the Mishna) is immediately followed by דעני ליצחק על גבי מדבחה ענין. This is followed by more Hebrew fillings e. g. דעני למשה אבינו על ים סוף ענין. But the two based upon the Aramaic narrative of Daniel are again Aramaic דעני לרניאל בגובא די, דעני לחנניה משאל ועוריה בגו אתון נורא ענין, and דעני לכורנבון דכורנבון לטוב לשם טוב לרוממה לקרן וקופה לאצלה דעובדן טבין לכל קהלא קדישא הדין מרברביכון ועד ועיריכון מלכא דעלמא יברך יתכון ויפש יתכון ויסגי יתכון וישמע לקול צלותכון ויעיק למעיקיכון ויכנש מברדינכון וישעי כל דחיקון ויבנה מקדשא בחייכון חברים כל בית ישראל מברדינכון. The old prayer דכירין לטוב included in an elaboration of the Kaddish in the ritual of Cochin<sup>32</sup>, shows the same phenomenon דכירין לטוב ועוד יהיה דוכרנבון לטוב לשם טוב לרוממה לקרן וקופה לאצלה דעובדן טבין לכל קהלא קדישא הדין מרברביכון ועד ועיריכון מלכא דעלמא יברך יתכון ויפש יתכון ויסגי יתכון וישמע לקול צלותכון ויעיק למעיקיכון ויכנש מברדינכון וישעי כל דחיקון ויבנה מקדשא בחייכון חברים כל בית ישראל מברדינכון. Similarly in the later Hebrew prayer for the dead ... מלפני שוכן מעונה<sup>33</sup> put together from older elements<sup>34</sup> וחולקא טבא לחיי העולם הבא שם תהא מנת ומחיצת וישיבת נפש . . . בנן עדן דאתפטר מן עלמא הדין כרעות אלהא מרא שמיא וארעא. המלך . . . The Hebrew prayer for the congregation, as contained in the Spanish ritual<sup>34</sup> contains two and a half lines of Aramaic.

Such changes from word to word and from phrase to phrase are to be found on every page of the Talmuds or Midrashim. It is clear that where such patchwork in the language of prayers could be suffered, the distinction between the two nearly related languages was by no means finely felt. Familiar words and expressions of either language very naturally became the common property of both, e. g. אבא אבא as in the prayer<sup>35</sup> . . . אבא אבא בקשת לבוא . . . In fact, as M. Friedmann says,<sup>36</sup> "Der größte Teil des rabbinischen

<sup>30</sup> Tamid 5 1 Ber 12a 7 11b 12 14a 2 GASTER 29 BAER 84.

<sup>31</sup> Amram II 21a.

<sup>32</sup> Cochin p. 23b ZUNZ, *Lit. Gesch.* 19.

<sup>33</sup> Yemen MSS. GASTER 200 LANDSHUTH, *Bikkur Holim* p. 102. ZUNZ, *Nachtrag Lit. Gesch.* p. 1.

<sup>34</sup> GASTER p. 112.

<sup>35</sup> J. Sanh. 65, 23b 3. Compare the use in Hebrew of words like תהא, יהא etc. שום, דייליה, דידי, פום, שום.

<sup>36</sup> Onkelos and Akylas p. 88. KAUTZSCH, *Die Aramaismen im alten Testament* p. 12 describes it as "ein Idiom . . in dem hebräische und aramäische Ele-

Wortschatzes ist in seinen Sprachformen und Redensarten hebraisiertes Aramäisch". Even in the carefully chosen language of the Palestinian פיוטים, the synagogue poetry from c. 650 C. E. onward, organically developed from this Neo-Hebrew, there is a wealth of hebraized Aramaic.<sup>37</sup> But this combination took place only between the intimately related Hebrew and Aramaic. The large Greek vocabulary of the Midrash was felt to be foreign, and is practically non-existent in the Piut.<sup>38</sup> *This phenomenon of the interchangeable use of the two languages, minimises the difficulty of the composite linguistic character of the books of Daniel and Ezra, by analogy from an era little subsequent to the date when these two books received their final form.* It should be noted that the book of Daniel is an unity. No artificial, makeshift theory, whether it be that of the Aramaic being for the people, the Hebrew for the learned; or that the "Chaldeans" should speak "Chaldee"; or that the Aramaic is translated from a Hebrew original, or the Hebrew from an Aramaic original; or that the text is composite by an accident of its history, or any other hypothesis, succeeds in explaining the absolutely abrupt change in 2 4, for which no satisfactory reason can be given, on the one hand, and the inclusion of chapter 7 in Aramaic on the other. The analogies here given make the simplest explanation probable, namely that *the composite character is original.*<sup>39</sup>

Genizah fragments of the Kaddish show interchanges between Aramaic and Hebrew other than in the traditional text, and Solomon b. Adereth (13<sup>th</sup> cent.) refers to partial translations into Hebrew. In the fragment published by S. Schechter<sup>40</sup> the text is, as usual, Aramaic

mente zu einer Einheit verschmolzen waren." Dr. ELBOGEN, *JQR*. XIX 1907, p. 246 finds it impossible to account for the juxtaposition of אמת ויציב. In view of the above it hardly requires explanation.

<sup>37</sup> Lists in ZUNZ *Synag. Poesie*, *Beilage* 5, p. 372. Cf. Ibn Ezra's commentary to Eccl 5 1 the second head of the indictment.

<sup>38</sup> Of course this does not apply to words which were thoroughly naturalised as פים, סימן, פרסם.

<sup>39</sup> This suggestion originally put forward by REUSCH, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*<sup>4</sup> 1870 p. 118 has since been practically lost sight of in the mass of complicated theories brought forward in the last thirty years. Jer 10 11 is difficult to account for. Later examples STEINSCHNEIDER *JQR* XVI 382.

<sup>40</sup> GDK. Hebrew part p. 53.



up to משיחיה. Then follows in Hebrew ראש <sup>41</sup> הכהן בחיי אדגנו אביתר הכהן. ישיבת נאון יעקב ובחיי רבינו שלמה הכהן אב הישיבה ובחיי רבנו צדוק השלישי. בחבורה בחייכון וביומיון ובחיי כל ישראל במהרה ובזמן קריב. . . . . The whole of the second paragraph is Hebrew ויתהלל שמו של מלך מלכי המלכים ברוך הוא למעלה ולמעלה מכל הברכות השירות התשבחות שמה דקדשא בריך הוא למעלה. So too, in Castile in the 14th century, the customary reading was מכל הברכות, ending the paragraph in Hebrew (omitting כרצונו).<sup>42</sup>

In a second Genizah fragment<sup>43</sup>, there is also a Hebrew honorific insertion ויצמח פורקניה) בחיי נשיאנו ראש הגולה ובחיי ראש הישיבה . . . . . ובחיי כל כל (!) ישראל; and the concluding words של גולה (ובחייכון. . . . . כל, בעגלה may also be intended for Hebrew—note בעגלה ובזמן קריב בחייכון וביומיון ובחיי דרבנא משה בר מיימון ובחיי בחייכון וביומיון בחיי נשיאנו ראש גלות ובחייכון ובחיי כל בית. . . . . or <sup>45</sup> דכל. . . the latter is in Hebrew.

It will be noticed that in nearly every case, the transition of language between word and word is facilitated by a proper name or some other word or words common to both Aramaic and Hebrew generally effected after a pause.

The question arises whether the Kaddish ever existed in a completely Hebrew form. In Massecheth Soferim<sup>46</sup> a prayer said while the roll of the Torah is taken from the Ark is given as follows: על הכל יתגדל ויתקדש וישתבח ויתפאר ויתרומם ויתנשא ויתעלה. הוא ויתהדר ויתהלל הנכבד והגורא שמו של מלך מלכי המלכים הקדוש ברוך הוא. בעולמות שברא העולם הזה והעולם הבא כרצונו וכרצון כל יראיו וכרצון כל עמו בית ישראל תגלה ותראה מלכותו עלינו במהרה ובזמן קריב והוא יבנה ביתו בימינו ויחון פליטתנו ופליטת עמו ישראל בהמון רחמיו וכרוב חסדיו בשלום בתן ובחסד וברחמים המקום הוא יעשה עמנו בעבור שמו הגדול ואמרו אמר

<sup>41</sup> Head of the Jews of Egypt in the second half of the 11th cent. See D. KAUFMANN, *Jahrbuch für jüd. Gesch. u. Literat.* Berlin 1898 p. 149f.

<sup>42</sup> Brit. Mus. Or. 5866 a 14th cent. MS. GASTER, *Isach Hassan* MS. Laur. II 16. Tur Oraḥ Ḥayyim 56. <sup>43</sup> GDK. Hebrew part p. 54.

<sup>44</sup> Sefer ha Yuhasin ed. FILIPOWSKI p. 219.

<sup>45</sup> Ib. at the election of the Exilarch.

<sup>46</sup> Sof. 14 12 text according to MÜLLER p. 196.

is clearly an expanded Hebrew version of a formula similar to the Kaddish, in style later than the more simple and direct language of the Kaddish. Note for instance the Midrashic expansion of העולמות into העולם הזה והעולם הבא. The occurrence of the Hebrew form of the response יהי שמו הגדול מבורך לעולם ולעולמי עולמים in Midr. Eccl. Rabba p. 25c to 9 14f. (D) and 23 times in Eliahu Rabba and Zutṭa, cannot be urged as a proof of the existence of the Kaddish in a Hebrew version. M. Friedmann<sup>47</sup>, however, concludes from this that the Kaddish was originally in Hebrew and was only later translated into Aramaic. But this judgment is based upon the early date (3rd cent.) to which he assigns this Midrash against the views of all other authorities e. g. RAPOPORT (*Nathan b. Jehiel*), ZUNZ *G. V.* 112/119, GRAETZ, DERENBOURG, GÜDEMANN, BACHER etc. who assign it to 968—984 C. E. (about 974). This date on the other hand is probably far too late, it being perhaps that of the copyist, and the compilation of the Midrash should perhaps be assigned to the 5th or 6th century. Moreover both in Midr. Eccl. and in T. B. E. R. and Z., this Hebrew version of the response occurs in a Hebrew text, and is therefore naturally in Hebrew in harmony with the rest of the text. We shall see later that in T. B. E. R. and Z. it is not correctly described as the response to the Kaddish, and also that the formula was used equally in Aramaic and Hebrew. Furthermore the occurrence of the Aramaic form in Hebrew texts,<sup>48</sup> would support just the opposite assumption of the originality of the Aramaic text as the Kaddish response. The old traditional name of the prayer קריש would also point to an Aramaic original (Appendix A Page 100). Furthermore, if a literal Hebrew equivalent of the Kaddish did ever exist, and we know of no complete one, the probability would be that it, like the version given above from Soferim 14 12, was a younger rendering of the Aramaic version of the old Aggada doxology. For in most cases where a prayer or formula exists both

<sup>47</sup> Introduction to TBER. and Z p. 78ff. Cf. HAMBURGER, *Real-Encyclopädie* II 605.

<sup>48</sup> Ber 3a<sub>5</sub> (B, p. 8) Shab 119b<sup>26</sup> (K, p. 43) Midr. Prov 14 28 (C, p. 8) Se'udath Gan 'Eden (F, p. 9). In the first two cases Abudarham quotes the text as Hebrew. The objection is always possible that in these cases the form of the response has been adapted to later custom.

in Hebrew and Aramaic, we may assume the Hebrew version to be the less original. The formula . . כל נדרי is probably older than the formula . . כל נדרים,<sup>49</sup> as the tendency was always towards excluding the use of the vernacular from the service and replacing it by the more sacred tongue. Solomon Adereth does not disapprove of the partial translations into Hebrew made of the Kaddish in his day. As the sermon doxology, the Kaddish was naturally in Aramaic. But in the liturgy the tendency would be to translate the Kaddish, the "holy praise" par excellence into Hebrew in accordance with the principle that the holy language may be used for treating of ordinary subjects, but must be used for holy matters: דברים של חול מותר לאומן בלשון קדש, של קדש אסור לאומן בלשון חול.<sup>50</sup>

Thus we may well assume the Aramaic of the Kaddish to be original. The explanation given by Zedekiah b. Abraham (13th cent.) in the Shibbole Haleket that it was translated from an original Hebrew text during a time of persecution to disguise the forbidden praise from the persecutors, and afterwards retained in Aramaic, is probably only an etiological explanation. But there may be the echo of the persecutions in the Byzantine Empire under the Emperor Justinian in the 6th century behind it. In 553 C. E. in his Novella 146 περί Ἑβραίων, following the example of Hadrian, he forbade the recital of the Shema' and the Trisagion and κενοφωνίαι (nonsense) and ἄλογοι ἐρμηνεῖαι (senseless expositions), definitely prohibiting all Aggadic preaching τὴν δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς λεγομένην δευτέρωσιν ἀπαγορεύομεν παντελῶς.<sup>51</sup> This prohibition would extend naturally to the Kaddish, the doxology of the Aggada.

Is the Kaddish Babylonian or Palestinian? It is usually assumed to be Babylonian. To answer this question more correctly we must endeavor to ascertain the date of its origin.

<sup>49</sup> The Tur Orah Hayyim 619 quotes the Aramaic formula for the first words as known to R. Natronai Gaon 710 CE, and half Aramaic and half Hebrew as known to Seadya Gaon d. 942. Cf. Maḥzor Vitry. Amram I 47a, Seadya and the Roman Rite use the Hebrew form. ZUNZ, *Ritus* 96.

<sup>50</sup> Shab 40b 10 Abaye 320—375 CE.

<sup>51</sup> GRAETZ, *Geschichte der Juden* V pp. 20 360. Phrases like ברוך המקדש שמך in the Jewish prayer book are usually taken as implying some such persecution.



It is first referred to under the name of קריש and definitely quoted in Massecheth Soferim. But as this work also knows later expansions of it—the קריש לחרתא and על הכל (p. 18), it certainly goes back to far earlier times. The Talmudic and Midrashic references<sup>52</sup> to the response יהא שמיה רבא מברך which need not imply the existence of the Kaddish at all, do nevertheless, as is invariably assumed, probably refer to this prayer (p. 50). The comparative silence of the Talmud about the Kaddish is explained by the fact that in early times it was not made the subject of Halacha as were the Shema' and Shemone 'Esre.<sup>53</sup> The absence of all reference to Jerusalem and the destroyed Temple, (contrast the later לחרתא), its simple eschatology, plain, unmystical language, straightforward form, agreement in wording and its anonymity, all point to an early date. The first two considerations would seem to set it before 72 C. E., and the fact that its wording, except for one or two minor additions in some cases, agrees exactly in all rites, would support an early date. And in fact, the Paternoster implies that a Kaddish-like prayer was in existence at the period of the rise of Christianity [Appendix D. Page 111]. Hence we may conclude that the Kaddish of the Aggada is based directly on an old formula that goes back into pre-Christian times.<sup>54</sup>

Of the two versions of the Paternoster, Luke 11 1 preserves a better tradition of the historical occasion than Matthew 6 5. One of the disciples asked Jesus to teach them to pray even as John taught his disciples. John the Baptist, if not a regular Essene, at least belonged to the same ascetic school as the Essenes, and frequent prayers, in part replacing sacrifices, especially prayers for the advent of the Kingdom of Heaven, and praises and sanctifications such as the Trisagion developed among the later mystics, were as characteristic of him and his disciples<sup>55</sup> as of the regular order of

<sup>52</sup> Ber 3a 4 (B, p. 8) 21b 21 (H, p. 43) 57a 5 (I, p. 43) Shabb 119b 26 (K, ib.) Succa 39a 2 (L, p. 50) Sota 49a 26 (A, p. 8). Midr. Pr. to 14 28 etc. (C, p. 8). Midr. Eccl 9 14 f. p. 25c (D, p. 9.). Alphabet of R. Akiba etc. (E, ib.) TBEZ. 20 (F, ib.).

<sup>53</sup> It is not mentioned in Meg. 4 3 as requiring ten persons present for its recitation for this reason. It belonged at that period entirely to the Aggada.

<sup>54</sup> So I. SCHWAB *Year Book of American Rabbis* 1905, but on quite other grounds. The response יהא שמיה רבא מברך, as we shall see, is of far higher antiquity, it going back to Biblical usage in direct tradition. <sup>55</sup> Luke 5 33 11 1.

the Essenes. Jesus was certainly not an Essene,<sup>56</sup> in fact he taught some strongly anti-Essene doctrines. But the early connection of Jesus with John; the many Essenic influences in his life and teaching, such as voluntary poverty, discountenancing marriage, the neglect of provision for earthly food and drink, the importance attached to lustrations, communistic meals and manner of life, healing the sick,<sup>57</sup> the gift of prophecy, aversion to taking an oath, the prominence given to eschatological ideas and speculation; and the comparison with John's prayers in the disciple's question, all point to the fact that *the prayer with which he answered is ultimately to be traced back to Essenic circles.*

HARNACK,<sup>58</sup> through a brilliant combination of the form of the prayer in Luke with Acts 19 2—6, comes to the conclusion that the prayer for the Holy Ghost, found according to some of the oldest MSS., Gregory of Nyssa (4th cent.), Marcion (c. 140) etc. in the version of Luke instead of the prayer for the Kingdom, was inserted expressly to differentiate the Paternoster from the prayer of the disciples of John: "Durch die Bitte um den heiligen Geist soll sich das Vater-Unser von dem Gebet der Johannesjünger unterscheiden" (l. c. p. 206). In proving this he rejects the historicity of the occasion of the giving of the prayer as recorded in Luke, but gives us in its stead a far more certain Johanno-Essenic origin for the New Testament version of the prayer. It is true however that he understands the Paternoster as consisting originally of only the word "Father" and the 4th, 5th and 6th phrases, while the 1st, 2nd and 3rd phrases in Matthew's version which are parallel with the opening words of the Kaddish, he regards as in all probability not original (p. 202f.), but, like all the prayers of the earliest Church, borrowed from the traditional Jewish liturgy,<sup>59</sup> and added

<sup>56</sup> As GRAETZ supposes l. c. III 276f. 699 et seq. 284 et seq.

<sup>57</sup> Essene from נִצְנִץ? But see E. MITTWOCH, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* XVII (1903) p. 76ff. who rejects also the suggestion of GRAETZ נִצְנִיצִים 'the Baptists', and the ancient identification with צִדִּיקִים 'seers'.

<sup>58</sup> AD. HARNACK, *Die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vaterunsers. Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie (Philos.-histor. Klasse)*. Berlin, 21 Jan. 1904 p. 204. Also printed separately.

<sup>59</sup> ZUNZ, *G V*. 384 et seq. on the high antiquity of the groundwork of the synagogue prayer book.



to the short prayer in very early times, perhaps as early as the times of the Apostles (p. 205). Even when assuming the correctness of this supposition, a pre-Christian date is assured for the origin of the Kaddish, and this traditional Jewish prayer may nevertheless have an Essenic origin. For we shall see later that there are probable traces of Essenic thought and mysticism in the amplification of the prayer to its later form. The institution of repeating the Kedusha (p. 8, note 39) is unmistakeably Essenic,<sup>60</sup> and KAUFMANN KOHLER<sup>61</sup> ventures to derive all the early Jewish prayers, including the Kaddish and Paternoster, from Hassidean or Essenic circles in a direct chain of tradition. Similarly HEIDENHEIM<sup>62</sup> supposes the old Hebrew prayers of the Samaritan liturgy to be of Essenic origin. So too, it may be more correct to say that the early Church derived its prayers from the Essenes,<sup>63</sup> than, as is always stated, from the Pharisaic synagogue. In the course of time, one part of the Essenes attached themselves to the new religion, the other became absorbed in Pharisaic Judaism. *To the former we would owe the Paternoster, to the latter the Kaddish.*<sup>64</sup>

We have therefore to qualify the statement that the Kaddish is Babylonian. In origin it is Palestinian. Its application as a doxology to the Midrash may also be Palestinian,<sup>65</sup> as the home of the Targum and Midrash was Palestine (Judea). In the course of

<sup>60</sup> Massecheth Soferim ed. MÜLLER p. 228.

<sup>61</sup> MGWJ XXXVII (1893) pp. 489—493 497. JQR. VII 1895 604—6.

<sup>62</sup> *Die Samarit. Liturgie.* Heft 1. p. XXXII.

<sup>63</sup> MAX FRIEDLÄNDER, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christentums.* Vienna 1894 esp. Ch. 4 for the connection of Essenism and early Christianity.

<sup>64</sup> Comparison with early Church liturgies reveals so many general parallels with the Kaddish in its praises, responses, prayer for the teachers and the teaching and for peace, and in its general phraseology, that they are of very little value. The simple expressions of prayer and praise, when scattered, are common property, and it is impossible to see in them direct borrowing from either side [see for example FERD. PROBST, *Liturgie der 3 ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte; Liturgie des vierten Jahrhunderts.* J. E. FIELD, *The Apostolic liturgy* etc.]. Samaritan formularies show no traces of the Kaddish in the late form in which we possess, them. The same is true too of Mandaic literature. See for instance ZDMG. LXI 1907 358 note 1, 360 note 1.

<sup>65</sup> Aaron ha Cohen of Lunel (fl. 1300) dates the prayer from the Mishnaic period.

time, with the transference of the centre of Jewish life from Palestine to Babylonia, the Kaddish also was carried over, as was the Targum. And as the (Onk.) Targum there received its distinctive literary form, so too did the Kaddish and all the paragraphs later added to it.<sup>66</sup> Together with most of the surviving prayers of the Jewish liturgy it has been handed down to us through the Babylonian schools. No ritual appears to preserve for us a purely Palestinian version; as even those lands that stood under the influence of Palestine in their ritual, preserve only the Babylonian form that held sway since the early middle ages. Even the version of Maimonides (and Yemen) is probably more Spanish-Babylonian than Egyptian-Palestinian.

In the following pages the texts are separated according to various rituals.<sup>67</sup> For the first two paragraphs this has its absolute value, as, except for the quite insignificant variant *ימלוך* and *ימלוך* in the Yemen ritual, every ritual is uniform within its own confines. The paragraph *להדחת* also appears in a settled form in each local class. But for the paragraphs *יהא שלמא*, *עושה שלום* and *על ישראל* there is little consistency among the MSS. belonging to the same ritual, especially in those of Yemen, where each text presents variations from every other. In other rituals, Spanish, German, Roman etc., the variation is slighter and the printed editions have fixed the text more definitely. It is not always practicable therefore to take note of all the variants in the numerous texts collated, and peculiarities of orthography and vocalisation have been regarded only when strongly attested or when indicating real difference of reading.

The orthography and sublinear punctuation found in the manuscripts is chaotic, every scribe (*סופר*) or punctuator (*נקדן*) going his own way and making a law for himself. The printed texts are but little better. They show no unity of system and are strongly hebraized. Some "errors" that recur constantly in manuscripts of

---

<sup>66</sup> DALMAN, therefore (Grammar p. 26) comes to the right conclusion that the Kaddish is a Babylonian prayer of Palestinian origin, although the reference to Sifre 132b on which he bases this result has nothing to do with the case. See p. 49 note 39.

<sup>67</sup> For the endless varieties of ritual see ZUNZ, *Ritus*. In brief *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Art. *Maḥzor*.

a particular rite, clearly point to a local difference in pronunciation. The value given to the signs at different times and places varied; the use of the divers signs is not constant and the grammatical forms also vary with the locality and period. It is therefore impossible for any one scheme of vocalisation to represent completely the many shades of pronunciation intimated by the diverging methods of pointing in the manuscripts.

The superlinear vocalisation, although in many ways defective, is far more selfconsistent and rests on an old and comparatively unvarying tradition of the pronunciation of Aramaic that reaches down to the present day.<sup>68</sup> For the Jews of Yemen still use the Targum in the synagogue service, and the Kaddish in view of its origin must have the same vocalisation as the Targum. Therefore BAER's emended punctuation on the basis of the Masoretic text of Biblical Aramaic, is, as BUXTORF's punctuation of the Targum on the same system, entirely at fault in principle.

I have therefore based the vocalisation in the following pages on the superlinear system. Very numerous inaccuracies and many variants have crept into the texts through the combined use of *matres lectionis* and vowel points. Among the inaccuracies arising from this cause is to be reckoned the lengthening of short vowels such as  $\text{מָאן}$  for  $\text{מֶן}$ ,  $\text{לְעִילָא}$  for  $\text{לְעֵלָא}$ , probably the use of Šureq for Qibbuṣ  $\text{פּוֹרְקִנִּיָּה}$  for  $\text{פּוֹרְקִנִּיָּה}$ ,  $\text{קוֹדֶשָׁא}$ ,  $\text{תּוֹשְׁבַתְתָּא}$ ,  $\text{פּוֹלְחָנָא}$  and  $\text{נוֹכְרָאָה}$  for  $\text{פְּרִקְנִיָּה}$  etc., although the use of Šureq for *u* is almost regular enough to justify itself. The use of Vav as a vowel letter in Aramaic inscriptions is more frequently found in the later than in the earlier inscriptions. As variants due to *matres lectionis* may probably be reckoned  $\text{רוּחָא}$  and  $\text{רוּיחָא}$  next to  $\text{סִיּוּעְתָּא}$ ,  $\text{סִיּוּעְתָּא}$  beside  $\text{וּיְמִלִּיךְ}$ , the almost invariable pointing  $\text{וּיְמִלִּיךְ}$  for  $\text{וּיְמַלֵּךְ}$ , as also the occasional  $\text{וּיְקָרִיב}$  for  $\text{וּיְקַרֵּב}$ ; probably also the relative  $\text{דִּי}$  for  $\text{דֵּי}$ ,  $\text{דִּי}$  affixed being later read as a separate word.

In punctuated texts, forms like  $\text{רְוּחָא}$ ,  $\text{עֲלִמִּיָּא}$ ,  $\text{שְׁמִיָּא}$ ,  $\text{אֲוִרִיָּתָא}$  etc. that often occur in the manuscripts are inadmissible, as are also  $\text{דִּינָא}$ ,  $\text{לְעִילָא}$  etc. The suffix of the 3rd person masc. sing. must be,

---

<sup>68</sup> ADOLF NEUBAUER, JQR. III 604—622 esp. p. 605 on the old tradition of the Jews of Yemen.





choice language<sup>4</sup>, and the language of prayer in particular was minutely weighed. The Kaddish, agreeing with all norms of prayer composition, is also worded with studious care. A characteristic of its oldest parts יתגדל and תתקבל is the synonymous doubling of expressions e. g. בעגלא ובזמן קריב, בחייכון וביומיכון, יתגדל ויתקדש, בעותהון [תתעבר], recalling very strongly the method of aiming at emphasis common in the period after the forceful power and incisiveness of the language of the early prophets had been lost, so frequently found in the book of Daniel.<sup>5</sup>

These words form a Messianic prayer growing out of Ezek 38 23, in the manner of an אפטרטא, the opening words of which were usually borrowed from a Biblical passage (פסוק) (פתיב, פסוקא, פסוק). Ezekiel's eschatological ideas of the final redemption at the end of days are very vivid, and the circumstantial account of the war with Gog and Magog, depicted in chapter 38, gave rise to an important chapter of Messianic teaching. The wars with Gog and Magog are regularly regarded in apocalyptic works and the Aggada, as ushering in the Messianic era.<sup>6</sup> The victory over the godless nations will result in the hallowing of God's Name in the world יתקדש שמה בעלמא (cf. Ezek 38 23), and in complete fulfilment of His Will, ברעותיה, His Kingship will then be fully revealed וימליך מלכותיה.<sup>7</sup>

However simple the words of this paragraph may appear, their sense is difficult to express adequately. The Catechismus Romanus issued by the Council of Trent understands the first half of the Paternoster thus:

Hallowed be Thy Name	} as in heaven so on earth
Thy Kingdom come	
Thy Will be done	

<sup>4</sup> Aboth 1 11 the warning חכמים הזהרו בדבריכם Cant. Rab. to 4 11 תפנה נפת ed. Wilna p. 28a similar warnings from the second and third centuries.

<sup>5</sup> E. g. in the Aramaic portion of Daniel alone 2 12, 2 12, בנס וקצף, 2 9, כדבה ושחיתה, 2 22, עמיקתא ומסתרתא (cf. 7 12), 2 21, ערניא וזמניא, 2 20, חכמתא וגבורתא, 2 14, עמא וטעם, 2 28 etc. So too 2 41 44 46 48 3 5 6 11 13 15 28 4 2 10 20 27 31 33 5 12 15 6 5 11 12 16 7 7 26. Cf. the style of אמת ויציב p. 15f and p. 56 note 11.

<sup>6</sup> Revel. 20 8 Sibyllines 3 319 ff. 512 ff. Jer. Targ. to Ex 40 11 Num 11 26 24 17 Deut 32 39 I Sam 2 10 Isa 33 22 f. LXX to Num 24 7 has Γῶγ for אנג and to Amos 7 1 for נבי.

<sup>7</sup> Obad 21 Ps 103 19 145 11—13 146 10 Dan 2 44 7 14.



and F. H. CHASE<sup>8</sup> is inclined to accept this as the original meaning. Without doubt, the Kaddish must be construed similarly according to the predominant thought and not strictly according to the order of the words. בעלמא must be joined in sense both backwards and forwards

יתגדל ויתקדש שמיא רבא  
וימליך מלכותיה

בעלמא {

the variant reading of the Yemenite rite ימלך for ימליך giving direct support to this. In the same way, although it is not necessary to separate כרעותיה from רבך, it belongs more truly to the thought of the two main clauses, as we shall see:

יתגדל ויתקדש שמיא רבא  
בעלמא דברא  
וימליך מלכותיה

כרעותיה {

In this way the number of possible combinations of the words is very large.<sup>9</sup> But the thought in the mind of the one who recited this prayer, although incompletely expressed, certainly extended the force of בעלמא and כרעותיה over both clauses, whether we regard it as a spontaneous prayer inadequately brought to expression, or as a carefully constructed form of words the full meaning of which could be brought out by the tones and emphasis of the speaker. The pregnancy of the construction can be only approximately suggested in a translation:—"May He, according to His Will, reveal in the world which He has created, the greatness and holiness of His great Name and His sovereignty . . .".

יתגדל.<sup>10</sup> Very many MSS. and some edit. treat ויתקדש as also the 7 praises . . יתברך as pausal, pointing ויתקדש. Ibn Ezra seems to have regarded these two words as Hebrew<sup>11</sup> as does the Maḥzor Vitry. But although יתרכי would be more purely Aramaic,

<sup>8</sup> F. H. CHASE, *The Lord's Prayer in the early Church* (Texts and Studies) p. 40f. The ancient *Opus Imperfectum*, WESTCOTT-HORT, English Parliamentary Papers 1903 no. 53 und NESTLE are of the same opinion. See NESTLE *Zeitschrift f. neutest. Wissenschaft* 1905 p. 107.

<sup>9</sup> Reading וימליך 10 combinations are possible; reading ימליך there are very many more. <sup>10</sup> Deut 32 3 Sirach 43 28.

<sup>11</sup> Ibn Ezra ספר מאונים 1140 writing on the sibilants, אם, אותיות השרקים סז"ש: אם, יהיה ראש הפועל סמך או שין יתאחר תו התפעל כי דרך תו התפעל להתקדם כמו יתגדל ויתקדש (ed. Venice 1546).

e. g. Ez 38 23 Targ., in the language of the Targum יתגדל would pass muster as Aramaic. The form with Pathah could very well be Hebrew. Kimḥi<sup>12</sup> reads in Dan 11 36 ויתרוֹמם ויתגדל where our Masoretic text has Šere (cf. ibid. 11 37 יתגדל). Brit. Mus. Bible MS. Or. 4445 dating from the middle of the 9th cent. has on folio 40 the note (על שם הכותב והמנקד יתגדל ל'יתא); hence the scribe and punctuator must have had יתגדל in Isa 10 15 (Dan 11 36).

וְיִתְקַדֵּשׁ<sup>13</sup> We cannot translate these two Ithpaals as pure passives "May His great Name be magnified and sanctified . . .", like the 7 praises . . . יתברך "May be blessed". They are medial "May there be revealed the greatness and holiness . . ." The order of the two words is thoroughly traditional in this form or as adjectives רבא וקדישא, גדול וקדוש.

שְׁמִיהָ Dan 2 20 4 16 as the inscriptions better than שְׁמִיהָ of most MSS. and edd. The medieval explanation<sup>14</sup> that saw in שְׁמִיהָ the equivalent of שֵׁם יְהוָה, although having no philological justification, offers a correct interpretation. Namely, in connection with Exod 17 16 בִּי יָד עַל כֶּסֶם יְהוָה מִלְחָמָה לָהּ בַּעֲמֹלֶק מִדֶּרֶד, the Name (יְהוָה for the Tetragrammaton) and Throne (כֶּסֶם for כְּסֵא) of God will not be complete until victory crowns the twelve months (Eduy 2 10) war with Gog and Magog = Amalek. Then will the greatness of God's Name first be fully revealed (Ezek 38 23).

On the form שֵׁם, see BARTH *N. B.* § 2c no. 7 p. 7. LAGARDE, *Übersicht* 159 8 160 10. D. G. 200.

A direct Name of God in the Kaddish is obviously avoided, שְׁמֵי שְׁמֵי, קודשא בריך הוא, (שְׁמֵי Dan 4 5 Ezr 5 1; Mandaic), שְׁמֵי and שְׁמֵי אֱבָרָה (וְהוֹן) being used instead. Leaving out of account the difficult passage Deut 28 58 לִירֹאָה אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַנִּכְבָּד וְהַנּוֹרָא הוּא אֶת ה' and the exceptional passage Lev 24 11 וַיִּקְלַל אֶת הַשֵּׁם . . . וַיִּקְלַל אֶת הַשֵּׁם and the exceptional passage Lev 24 11 וַיִּקְלַל אֶת הַשֵּׁם . . . וַיִּקְלַל אֶת הַשֵּׁם this avoidance of pronouncing the Tetragrammaton is probably already to be traced in exilic times.<sup>15</sup> The transference is perhaps

<sup>12</sup> David Kimḥi (1160–1235) Michlol p. 76.

<sup>13</sup> Lev 22 32 Isa 29 23 Mal 1 11 (Targ.). Sirach 36 4 Luke 1 49 Koran 2 28.

<sup>14</sup> Pesikṭa Rab. Ch 12 p. 51a Maḥzor Vitry p. 8 Tosafoth Ber 3a etc. etc.

<sup>15</sup> Compare Targ. to 24 16 and Sanhed 7 5 המגדף אינו חייב עד שיפרש השם.

<sup>16</sup> BEN JAKOB, *Im Namen Gottes* p. 167. Compare the usage in the Assouan Papyri with that of Ezra and Nehemiah.

to be seen in verses like **אלהים בשמך הושיעני** Ps 54 3.<sup>17</sup> By the third century B. C. the Tetragrammaton was certainly regarded as a "nomen ineffabile". The book of Daniel avoids it and **אדני** except in the prayer chap. 9 and 12 (**אדני**). In the books of Esther and 1st Maccabees these Names do not occur at all, "Heaven" replacing them in the latter work. The old term **שם המפורש** for the Tetragrammaton, according to BACHER<sup>18</sup> equivalent to "the distinguished, preeminent Name", although most probably to be understood as "the Name distinctly pronounced",<sup>19</sup> is explained by M. GRÜNBAUM<sup>20</sup> as "the separated, secret Name". **זה שמי לעלם** (Exod 3 15) was homiletically interpreted as **זה שמי לעלם** (or **לעלם**) Kid 71a<sub>17</sub>; and **אֵת** Isa 57 11, read by the LXX and Vulg. as **וַיִּמְעַלְם**, and **הָעֵלָם** Eccl 3 11 treated as **לְעוֹלָם**, are also made to refer to this avoidance of uttering the Tetragrammaton.

It was spoken in the Temple in the Priestly Blessing<sup>21</sup> until, according to one tradition, the death of Simon the Just, 270 B. C., and ten times on the Day of Atonement,<sup>22</sup> whereas outside the Temple the name **אדני** was used in its stead. With the destruction of the Temple, the distant way of speaking of God evidenced everywhere<sup>23</sup> became the rule. E. LANDAU<sup>24</sup> enumerates 57 usual expressions (**פְּנוּיִים**) used in designating God.<sup>25</sup>

In the Mishna occur phrases such as **הַבָּשָׂר לֹשֶׁן** (Shek 6 6), **אֶחָד** **שְׁמָא רַבָּא** (Yoma 4 1).<sup>26</sup> In the Jer. Targumim **שְׁמָא רַבָּא** or

<sup>17</sup> Compare the remarkable phrase Isa 30 27 **הִנֵּה שֵׁם ה' בָּא מִמְרוֹק**. Further Ps 7 18 9 3 92 2.

<sup>18</sup> ETT. pp. 159f. 186f. ETA. 218.

<sup>19</sup> MUNK, *Guide des Égarés* I 267, GEIGER, *Urschrift* p. 264, DALMAN, *Der Gottesname Adonaj* 52f., BACHER, ETT. 159f.

<sup>20</sup> ZDMG. XXXIX esp. pp. 543—572.

<sup>21</sup> Num 6 22—27 Sota 7 6 and p. 38a<sub>18</sub> Tamid 7 2 Sanh 101b 22.

<sup>22</sup> T. Yoma 21 183 1 Yoma 39b.

<sup>23</sup> LXX **νόμος** Matth 6 9 10 28 Luke 12 5. Specially characteristic of the Targum.

<sup>24</sup> *Die dem Raume entnommenen Synonyma für Gott in der neuhebr. Literat.* Zürich 1888 p. 6ff.

<sup>25</sup> Jacob Ba'al ha Turim (fl. 1300) to Num 11 16 enumerates 70 Biblical designations of God, reproduced ZDMG. XXXV 167. Moslem theologians reckon 99.

<sup>26</sup> Similar to the usage in Acts 5 41 3 John 7.

<sup>27</sup> Gen 22 19 J I, 25 22 Eccl 3 11 (not ed. LAGARDE), Cant 2 17.



more fully שמא רבא וקדישא,<sup>29</sup> שמא רבא ודחילא,<sup>28</sup> שמא רבא ויקירא etc.<sup>30</sup> occur simply as the equivalent of ה'. According to the Masora to Onkelos Exod 22 19 and Lev 16 9 the tradition of the school of Sura read לשמא דה' in the former passage, קדם ה' in the latter and the school of Nehardea vice versa. Onkelos to Gen 25 22 has ה', the Jer. Targumim שם רבא. Clearly then שום, שמא and the more common שם רבא are simply substituted for the Tetragrammaton; so that שמיה רבא, the הזכרת השם in the Kaddish, is nothing but a metonymy for God. The Samaritans similarly always employ the word שמא when reading their Pentateuch<sup>31</sup> but they used the Tetragrammaton in oaths (J. Sanh. 10 1, 28b<sup>5</sup>).

The other designations of God occurring in the Kaddish קודשא (דבשמיא, אב (והון) רבשמיא, בריך הוא שמיא, noticed later, are similarly nothing but the most commonly used of the more distant designations of God. In the Mishna Aboth, in which tractate the Name of God has most occasion to be mentioned השם = שמא occurs once, הקדוש אב ( ) דבשמיא = אב ( ) שבשמים 3 times, ברוך הוא = ברך הוא once, and שמיא = שמים eight times. The other appellations not occurring in the Kaddish are המקום five times, occurring in the Hebrew version of the Kaddish in Soferim 14 12 (p. 18) and השכינה once. Mishna Yoma has המקום, הקב"ה, אביכם שבשמים and אביכם once each, השם in prayers and " in Biblical passages.<sup>32</sup>

רַבָּא as seen above, is the usual adjective qualifying שמא when used to designate God. It goes back to Biblical usage like<sup>33</sup> שמך שמי הגדול or הגדול (Jer 44 26). In the corresponding Hebrew Kaddish of Soferim 14 12 it appears as שמו הגדול. It is of very general occurrence in the oldest prayers.

<sup>28</sup> J I Exod 4 20 16 25 32 25 Lev 16 21 24 11 Deut 9 19.

<sup>29</sup> J I Deut 9 19 28 58.

<sup>30</sup> J I Exod 28 30 Num 31 8.

<sup>31</sup> J. H. PETERMANN, *Samarit. Gram.* 1878 p. 78. ABRAHAM GEIGER, *Nachgelassene Schriften* III 261.

<sup>32</sup> DWJ. 159. On the whole question of the use of שם etc. see M. GRÜNBAUM, ZDMG. XXXIX 543—572, XL. NESTLE ib. XXXII 468 500 506. G. DALMAN, *Der Gottesname Adonaj (Studien zur biblischen Theologie)* Berlin 1889 p. 36 et seq. BEN JAKOB, *Im Namen Gottes*. Berlin 1903. E. LANDAU, *Die dem Raume . . .* SCHÜRER, *Jahrbuch für Protest. Theologie* II 1876. 168 ff.

<sup>33</sup> Josh 7 9 I Kgs 8 42 Jer 10 6 Ezek 36 23.









the idea being closely bound up with that of the  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>46</sup> The parallel prayer in Soferim 14 12 runs  $\text{שמו . . . יתגדל . . . בעולמות}$  and the meaning certainly is not that God created this world and the world to be  $\text{כרצון כל עמו בית ישראל}$ . In the Kaddish  $\text{כרעותיה}$  must be taken in sense with the whole passage, backwards with  $\text{יתגדל ויתקדש שמה רבא}$  and forwards with  $\text{מלכותיה}$ ; and in the Hebrew version  $\text{כרצונו}$  must extend its force both backwards and forwards. For both the revelation of God's greatness and holiness and of His Kingship are according to His Will.

The idea of praise, especially that arising from prayer or study, which hastens the approach of Messianic times,<sup>47</sup> being acceptable to God and according to His Will, is one that continually recurs.<sup>48</sup> Especially noteworthy are three passages:

(1) The second paragraph of the Kaddish in the Genizah fragment (G. D. K. 53)  $\text{... שמה . . . לעילא מכל ברכתא שירחא . . . דאמירן}$  and in the Hebrew fragment similarly  $\text{האמורות בעולם כרצונו ואמ' אמן}$ .

(2) The saying B (p. 8) from Ber. 3a:  $\text{בשעה שישראל עושין רצונו}$  של מקום ונכנסין לבתי כנסיות ולבתי מדרשות ועונין יהא שמה וג'.

(3) Yalkut I 408 to ויקהל  $\text{בכל שבת ושבת ולכנום}$  בבתי מדרשות ללמד ולהורות לישראל דברי תורה איסור והיתר כרי שיהא שמי הגדול מתקלם . . . אמר משה אם אתם עושים כסדר הזה הקב"ה מעלה עליכם  $\text{בבתי מדרשות ללמד ולהורות לישראל דברי תורה איסור והיתר כרי שיהא שמי הגדול מתקלם}$ . "To gather assemblies every sabbath and to come together in the study houses to teach Israel the words of the Torah, what is forbidden and what allowed so that My great Name may be praised . . . Moses said: 'If you carry out this re-

stantly. Zunz GV<sup>2</sup> p. 389e. במימריה (e. g. Gen 21 33 J II, Deut 33 27 Onk) is the regular Aram. of  $\text{ברבורו}$  etc. BACHER, *ETA*. 36 on  $\text{ברבור}$ .

<sup>46</sup> Hebrews 1 2  $\delta\iota' \omicron\upsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \alpha\lambda\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma \varepsilon\pi\omicron\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ .

<sup>47</sup> According to a general belief the time for the Messiah to reveal himself had long arrived, but his appearance was kept back until the people should be worthy of him e. g. Micah 4 8 Targ.  $\text{ואת משיחא דישראל דמיר מן קדם חובי כנישתא}$ . R. E. J. XXXV 1897 282ff. SCHÜRRER, *GJV*. II 618f. and literature there given.

<sup>48</sup> Prov 15 8  $\text{תפלת ישרים רצונו}$  Ps 69 14  $\text{עת רצון ה' עת רצון}$  Ps 147 11  $\text{רוצה בעידן ראתון עבדין רעותי}$  Targ.  $\text{בעת רצון עניתך}$  Isa 49 8  $\text{ה' את יראיו את המיחלים לחסדו}$  אני מקביל צלותך.



gulation, the Holy One, blessed be He, will regard you as making Him sovereign in His world'." These three passages leave little doubt that the true construction of כרעותיה is with the two main ideas of the paragraph, יתנוד and מלכותיה. ימליך רעות occurs in the late Aramaizing Hebrew of Ecclesiastes as "longing, striving" in the frequent phrase רעות רוח, and in Biblical Aramaic (Ezra 5 17 7 18). It is in its various forms רעו, רעותא, רענא, a *Ḳatl* form, and it is unnecessary to correct the usual construct רעות into רעות, as MERX suggests (*Chrestomathia Targumica*).

וימליך, not the invariably occurring Hebraizing form ימליך. The second Yod is again only a mater lectionis, very often inserted in unpointed texts to indicate an E sound e.g. מַקְבִּיל, ירְבִּיק etc., here especially to avoid reading וימלך, a reading found consistently<sup>49</sup> in the Yemen MSS. It is true that in sound trilateral verbs in Biblical Aramaic, only forms with the *Ḥirek* יהשפֿל, תהנוק, משפֿל occur; and in Biblical Aramaic in general the form with the *Ḥirek* prevails over that with *Ṣere* such as תמלל. But in Rabbinical Aramaic the second characteristic vowel of the Afel is, according to all traditions, *Ṣere*.

The Yemenite reading וימלך is hardly defensible, whether מלכותיה be taken as a locative "in His Kingdom" or as an added cognate accusative strengthening and specifying the verb ימליך "as to His Kingdom". It is defended<sup>50</sup> by the supposition that the Afel would mean "cause some one else to reign". The Yemen texts vary between ימלך and וימלך.<sup>51</sup>

מלכותיה<sup>52</sup> 'His Kingship', not as BOUSSET, SCHÜRER<sup>53</sup> etc. 'His political, physical Kingdom'. This is plain from Biblical verses,<sup>54</sup>

<sup>49</sup> A solitary instance of וימליך in the Kaddish de Rabbanan occurs in Or. 1479 no doubt under the influence of other rites. The Peal form may either have arisen from a wrong punctuation of וימלך, or from a confusion of Vaw and Yod in וימלך. <sup>50</sup> Commentary in the printed edition תכלאל Jerus. 1894.

<sup>51</sup> ימלך for instance is read by Or. 2227 2418, DWJ. one text etc. וימלך by Or. 1479 1480 2389 GASTER 321 A etc.

<sup>52</sup> DWJ. 75—83, SCHÜRER, *Jahrbuch für Protest. Theologie* II 1876 p. 175 et seq. SCHÜRER, *GJV*. 2 628 f. gives literature.

<sup>53</sup> BOUSSET, *Religion d. Judenthums* 199 et seq., SCHÜRER, *GJV*. 2 588 et seq.

<sup>54</sup> Jer 10 7 10 Obad 21 Ps 22 29 47 3 8 98 6 103 19 145 11—13 146 10 Dan 2 44 7 14 1 Chr 29 11 f. etc.

the language of the oldest prayers,<sup>55</sup> the apocalyptic and apocryphal literature,<sup>56</sup> and from repeated passages in the Targum and Rabbinic idiom generally.<sup>57</sup> Hence *ימליך מלכותיה* must be translated "may He reveal His Sovereignty", not as usually "may He establish His Kingdom." The corresponding phrase in the Hebrew version of Soferim 14:12 runs *תגלה ותרצה מלכותו*. For in the Jewish view, God's Kingship over Israel and the world is and always has been established, but only after the Messianic kingdom will it be for the first time fully revealed.<sup>58</sup> *Zach 14 9* *למלך על כל הארץ* appears in the Targum as *ויתגלי מלכותא דה' על כל יתבי ארעא* (אומר לציון) *מלך* Isa 52 7 *ויתגלי מלכותא דה'* על כל יתבי ארעא becomes *אתגליאת מלכותא דאלהך* Obad 21 *המלוכה* *והיתה לה'* *ויתגלי מלכותא דה'* *בקריב על כל יתבי ארעא ויהי מלכותא דה' לעלם ולעלמי עלמיא*.<sup>59</sup> In Esther II 1 1 beginning, occur *מלכותיה* *תתנדל מלכותיה* על כל דיירי ארעא and *עלן* *ה'* *צבאות דבענלא תתנדל מלכותיה* *על כל דיירי ארעא* and *עלן* So too in the Midrash constantly *גלה* e. g. Cant Rab 17c to 2 13 (ref. to 2 12 *הגיע זמנה של מלכות שמים שתגלה*), *עת הזמיר הגיע* The Arabic loan word *مَلَكُوت* used only of divine rule is borrowed from *מלכות* used in this sense without further qualification.<sup>60</sup>

The added words in Maim., Yemen, Abud., Mod. Span., Cochin,

<sup>55</sup> Sabbath 'Amidah (Amram 29b) *ישמחו במלכותך*; the very old New Year 'Amidah *ושתחוו לפניך כל הברואים ויעשו כלם אנחה אחת לעשות רצונך בלבב שלם* or *גלה* *נבחר מלכותך עלינו מהרה*. Shem. 'Esre 11 *לברך אתה מלך עלינו* *לברך אתה מלך עלינו*, the old Kaddish like prayer (Amram 9a Vitry 67) *מלכנו אלהינו יחד שמך בעולםך יחד מלכותך בעולםך* Sabbath Kedusha (Amr. 10b) *ענינו תראינה במלכותך* 'Alenu (probably much earlier than Rab 230 CE. See Jewish Encycl. HAMBURGER, *Real Encycl.* Suppl. 2 6) *לתקן עולם במלכות שרי ויקבלו עול מלכותך ותמלך עליהם לעולם ועד כי המלכות שלך היא ולעולם עד עולם* *עולם במלכות שרי ויקבלו עול מלכותך ותמלך עליהם לעולם ועד כי המלכות שלך היא ולעולם עד עולם* phrases like *מלכותך ראו בניך* etc. etc.

<sup>56</sup> E. g. Tobit 13 11 et seq. 14 6.

<sup>57</sup> E. g. *קבל (עול) מלכות שמים* Ber 22 5 etc. is the confession of belief in God's unity and dominion.

<sup>58</sup> Sifre Deut 32 10 p. 134b has the following significant Midrash: *עד שלא בא אבינו אברהם לעולם כְּנִיכֹל לא היה הקב"ה מלך אלא על השמים בלבד שנאמר ה' אלהי השמים אשר לקחני ... אבל משבא אבינו אברהם לעולם המליכו על השמים ועל הארץ שנאמר ה' אלהי השמים ואשר לקחני* (Gen 24 3) "Before the time of Abraham God was, as it were, King of heaven alone (with reference to Gen 24 7 'God of heaven'), but since his time, He has been King over heaven and earth (with reference to Gen 24 3 'the God of heaven and the God of earth')." Cf. Targ. Jer. Gen 24 3.

<sup>59</sup> Compare Targ. to Isa 31 4 40 9 Ezek 7 7 10 Mic 4 7.

<sup>60</sup> ABR. GEIGER, *Was hat Mohammed* p. 59.



Carpentras, Romania, Corfu etc. go back in part to a very early variant in the text and may possibly be attributed to the difference between the Palestinian and Babylonian recensions.

וַיִּצְמַח At least פורקניה would seem to be original to one early recension (? Palestinian), the doubled expressions characterising the style of the prayer favoring its originality. The root צמח is used with a directly Messianic meaning. צמח is a traditional designation for the Messiah<sup>61</sup> and the verb צמח is constantly used with קרן or פורקן (ישועה) in a Messianic connection.<sup>62</sup> The intimate relationship of the two ideas צמח and פורקן is exemplified by Targum paraphrases such as אקים פורקן לבית ישראל (Ezek 29 21) becoming אקים פורקן לבית ישראל or וישעך צמח (Ezek 16 7) being turned as כנישתכון פורקן ממצא.

פֶּרְקָנָה The form פֶּרְקָן in punctuated texts is better than פורקן. Biblical Aramaic has Kōtlan forms with Kameš (ed. BAER, Ḥaṭef Kameš) פֶּלְחֻן Ezra 7 19, שְׁכֻלְתָּנוּ Dan 5 11 12 14. Seadya reads (infra p. 62) תִּשְׁבַּחְתָּא. Mandaic and the Targum always have the form with Vav. The vowels *u* and *o* were used however almost promiscuously. קָרְבֵּן occurs Neh 10 35 13 31 beside the otherwise invariable קָרְבָּן. [מָדָר] Dan 2 11 contrasts with [מָדוּר] Dan 4 22 29 5 21. גִּלְגֻּלְתָּא appears in Matth 27 33 as γολγοθᾱ. שׁוּפֵט is presented to us in Phoenician as 'suffetes'. In Onkelos Exod 28 3 the Masora of the school of Sura requires תְּקַמָּא that of Nehardea הוֹכְמָא. There is a similar difference between *o* and *u* in East and West Syrian.

On the form פורקן BARTH *N. B.* § 194 p. 318 p. XXIX note 1 ABR. GEIGER, *Was hat Mohammed* 55f. D. G. 174.

<sup>61</sup> J. Ber 2 4 5a 13 Isa 4 2 Targ. Jer 23 5 33 15 Zech 3 8 6 12.

<sup>62</sup> Ps 61 9 יום יום is expanded by the Targum to ביום וביום דפורקנא דישאל וביום דיתרבי מלכא משיחא למחוי מלך ... אלא לפורקניה רמשיח בר דוד דהוא (GINSBURGER, *Fragmenten Targ.* p. 74) reads פורקן עתיד לאפקא ית ישראל מן גלותא. Ps 132 17 Jer 33 15. Amram 53a Soferim 19 9 (New moon blessing), Karaite marriage blessing בימינו יצמח במלך המשיח יצמח. Shem. 'Esre 2 Palest. version תצמיח לנו ישועה עין ישועה. Shem. 'Esre 15 Babyl. version, Soferim 13 13 Amram I 29b JRH. 46 59c 22 Haftarah blessing תצמיח קרן ישועה and את צמח דוד מהרה תצמיח. The short Shem. 'Esre הבינו DWJ., *Anhang* 304 Babyl. צמיחת קרן עבדך. Palest. הצמחת קרן לדוד עבדך. צמח דוד עבדך. New Year Mussaf 'Amidah קרן עבדך. רחמנא ארים ימינך ואצמח פורקנך Amram II 20a רחמנא The elaborate פורקניה בחייון of the Yemen Cod. GASTER 243f. 132af. יקום פורקנא רחמנא ובימינך.





Amos 8 2). For the true time of the קץ is hidden. In the account of the Jer. Targumin to Gen 49 1 Jacob wished to reveal the קיצא גניזא J I, קיצא גניזא J II Gen 49 1 2, to his sons, but at that moment it was hidden from him.<sup>67</sup> According to the Talmud Meg 3a<sup>17</sup> Jonathan b. Uzziel was not allowed to furnish the Hagiographa with a Targum משיח דאית בה קץ משיח, and the discussions (Sanh 97b—99a) about the expected advent of the Messiah do not come to any definite conclusion.

The expressions עקב יומיא, סוף יומיא although sometimes used in the sense of קץ e. g. Exod 40 9 J I מלכא משיחא דעתיד למפרק ית ישראל J I, בסוף יומיא (cf. 40 11 J I), Gen 3 16 J II דמלכא ביומיו מלכא J II, as a rule bear a less definite meaning and correspond more with the vague אחרית הימים.<sup>68</sup>

A close and instructive parallel to the two readings here, is again offered by the prayer מלכנו אלהינו (p. 36, note 55), which, as a closing prayer, shows a striking similarity with the Kaddish in both thought and expression. Amram I 9a reads there קרב משיח (= ויקרב משיח) as does the old Genizah variant of the closing prayer אלהי נצור.<sup>69</sup> In the later work, the Maḥzor Vitry the expression is amplified to קרב קץ ביאת משיח (= ויבע קץ משיח). The elaborate Kaddish of the Cochin prayer book (p. 23a) contains a paragraph before האל אב הרחמן יחיש הקץ וימהר עושה שלום opening האל אב הרחמן יחיש הקץ וימהר followed by an answering paragraph הנאולה.

**משיחיה** The popular belief in a personal Messiah dates from the time of Herod. The absence of any reference to the Messiah in the "Messianic" Kaddish in its simple form, would support the early date assigned to this paragraph. For the ordering of the ideas, the advent of the Messiah (ויקרב משיח) and the redemption (ויפרוק עמיה and ויצמה פורקניה) mentioned after ימליך מלכותיה, would seem to stamp all except ימליך מלכותיה as a later amplification.

---

לעוה"ב. The plural of קץ in later Hebrew is קצים as in מחשבי קצים; Biblical Hebrew only recognises קצת.

<sup>67</sup> Compare Tanḥuma ibid. p. 108b. Midrash Eleh Ezkera, JELLINEK, BH. II 73 etc.

<sup>68</sup> Num 24 14 OJ, Deut 31 29 Isa 2 2 etc.

<sup>69</sup> Published by GASTER, GDK. p. 239.







דְּכָל-בֵּית-יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבִתְּיָי Even private prayer according to one opinion<sup>73</sup> should be framed so as to include the whole congregation, and from an extension of the same principle the prayer of a congregation is usually made to include the whole congregation of Israel.<sup>74</sup>

Maim. and Yemen read with the redundant possessive suffix וּבִתְּיָהוֹן דָּכַל. This construction, occurring even in Onkelos,<sup>75</sup> is in the Kaddish especially characteristic of Maimonides and Yemen in their readings דְּכָל בְּעוֹתָהוֹן דָּכַל (p. 66), קָהֳלָהוֹן דִּישְׂרָאֵל (p. 70). Otherwise מְרִיָּה דְשְׂמִיָּה וְאַרְעָא occurring in the Roman, Spanish etc. rituals is the only example in the Kaddish.

בְּעִנְיָא speedily, literally: in haste. Hamanhig, Carpentras and Lille and some old MSS (GASTER, Cod. 73, Laur. II 52, Commentary of Pereš Cod. Montefiore 53) read בְּעִנְיָא (cf. Job 20 5 Targ. Syr. ܒܥܝܢܝܐ — Gen 18 6) Esth II 1 1 ed. LAGARDE reads מְלֻכּוּתִיָּה דְּבְעִנְיָא תְּתַנְּלִי מְלֻכּוּתִיָּה. It is frequently coupled with

כֵּן תְּשַׁתְּלַח אֲסוּתָא e. g. Amram I 52b the first בְּעִנְיָא וּבִזְמַן קָרִיב. In TBER. 18 95 the Aramaic בְּעִנְיָא וּבִזְמַן קָרִיב and אמרו קריב occurs as a familiar expression in the Hebrew text. So too partly Aramaic ib. 19 110 מהרה ובזמן קריב as in the Genizah fragment quoted above (p. 18). In the Hebrew version of the Kaddish of Soferim 14 12 it appears as במהרה ובזמן קריב.

זְמַן is better than זְמַן. The best texts in Dan 2 16 7 12 (ed. STRACK) have the Pathah and although Biblical Hebrew only testifies to the pausal form זְמַן, here also זְמַן is probably the correct ground form of this Aramaism, rather than the usually accepted form זְמַן. זְמַן of the superlinear punctuation is an error for זְמַן. It occurs in Arabic as a loan word both as زَمَن and زَمَان.<sup>76</sup>

קָרִיב, used of place and time,<sup>77</sup> is usually so punctuated in both systems. It is really a Hebraizing vocalisation, as is יוֹקָרֵב.

וְאָמְרֵי does not appear in Amram, Carpentras, old Castilian

<sup>73</sup> Abaye (d. 339) Ber 29b<sub>1</sub> צִיבּוּרָא בְּהָרִי נִפְשִׁיהּ אִינִישׁ לִישְׁתָּף לְעוֹלָם לִישְׁתָּף אִינִישׁ נִפְשִׁיהּ בְּהָרִי צִיבּוּרָא.

<sup>74</sup> 2 Mac 16 "And now we pray here (in Jerusalem) for you (in Egypt)." Commonly in closing formulae such as Derech Ereš Zutṭa במהרה וְאַרְעָא דְּיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרִימִינוּ וּבִימִי כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל אָמֵן.

<sup>75</sup> Gen 6 16 14 12 19 25 36 43 etc.

<sup>76</sup> NÖLD., *Mand. Gram.* 152 § 127. DG. 79 146.

<sup>77</sup> Targ. to Deut 32 35 Isa 13 22 Ezek 36 8 etc.

and many old MSS,<sup>78</sup> where it is wanting also in the later paragraphs; but it may nevertheless have been supplied in actual recitation. The invariable punctuation found is the Hebrew one וְאָמַר, just as וְנִאֲמַר occurs at the end of the Aramaic prayer יְקוֹם פּוֹרְקֵן (p. 90). In spite of the commonness of the word that could well have made it a fixed term common to both Hebrew and Aramaic, and the similarity of sound between the Hebrew and Aramaic וְאָמַר, it is probably more truly read as Aramaic as is also וְנִאֲמַר in יְקוֹם פּוֹרְקֵן. Biblical Aramaic would require וְאָמַרְי (Dan 2 9). The super-linear vocalisation usually has אִימְרִי and this form probably should be read here in the Kaddish. All three forms (Hebr. and Aram.) are written in unpointed texts וְאִימְרִי.

אָמֵן properly Hebrew meaning 'verily, truly' BARTH, *N.B.* 5c. 7b. It is also a naturalised loan word in Aramaic and cannot therefore support the vocalisation וְאָמַרְי. As a response, it is used liturgically in the Old Testament<sup>79</sup> and, a fact of special interest here, to seal closing doxologies.<sup>80</sup> It was taken over very freely by the Christian Church and occurs 119 times in the New Testament. The Tanna R. Jose b. Zimra<sup>81</sup> distinguishes three uses of אָמֵן: שבועה affirmation, קבלה acceptance and אמונה faith. It was used constantly in daily life<sup>82</sup> and in the synagogue service,<sup>83</sup> and great importance was attached to it as a response,<sup>84</sup> since it is equivalent to saying the whole blessing. Therefore every doxology required an אָמֵן from the congregation to complete it—the אָמֵן of קבלה, the reader prompting with וְאָמַרְי, the congregation responding אָמֵן.

<sup>78</sup> Or. 5,866 Add. 18,690 19,667 27,086 Laur. II 16, 52 etc.

<sup>79</sup> Deut 27 15—26 (12 times) 1 Kgs 1 36 Neh 5 13 Jer 11 5 28 6 Num 5 22 Neh 8 6.

<sup>80</sup> Ps 106 48 = 1 Chr 16 36; אָמֵן וְאָמֵן Ps 41 14 72 19 89 53.

<sup>81</sup> J. Sota 2 5 18b 3 Shebuoth 36a 23. Cf. ib. 29b Midr. Ps 89 4 Ps 106 end Deut. Rab. Ch 7 beginning, of R. Jehuda b. Simon. BACHER, *Agada der Paläst. Amoräer* I 112f. Jose b. Hanina.

<sup>82</sup> The mosaic inscription of Kefr Kenna ends אָמֵן בְּרַכְתָּא לְהוֹן לְדָבָא, *Ephemeris* I 314.

<sup>83</sup> On the notice אָמֵן בְּמִקְרָא see page 46 f.

<sup>84</sup> Ber 8 8 1 Cor 14 16 Vitry p. 97 Ber 53b<sub>8</sub> Ber 47a<sup>21</sup> DS. the manner of answering אָמֵן. Shab 119b Soferim 21 6 Midr Ps 31 8 Sanh 110b<sub>1</sub> 111a<sup>1</sup>, Alphabet of R. Akiba 1st recension JELL., *BH.*, III 27 (connected with Isa 26 2) the importance of אָמֵן.

## יְהֵא שְׁמִיה רַבָּא מְבָרַךְ לְעֵלְמָא וּלְעֵלְמִי עֲלָמָיָא

Great importance is attached to this response in the passages A B C D F (page 8f). In addition the following may be quoted (H) Ber 21b<sup>21</sup> D. S.; the question in dispute is whether one who is saying the Shemone 'Esre should interrupt his recitation to give this response: **איבעיא להו מהו להפסיק ליהא שמיא רבא מברך? כי אתא רב דימי אמר ר' יהודה ור"ש תלמידיו דר' יוחנן אמרי לכל אין מפסיקין חוץ מן יהא שמיא הגדול מברך שאפילו עוסק במעשה מרכבה (Ezek 1) פוסק ועונה ולית הלכתא כוותיה**. "When the question was asked as to whether one should interrupt or not, R. Dimi reported a 2nd century tradition that one should interrupt the recitation of the Shemone 'Esre only for this response, for even the mystic study of the chariot (Ezek 1)<sup>1</sup> should be interrupted for it. The ruling however is not so." Further (I) (Ber 57a<sup>4</sup>) [בחלום] **יהא שמיא רבא מברך** [בחלום] **העונה יהא שמיא רבא מברך**. "It is a sure omen of salvation when one gives this response in a dream." And again (K) (Shab. 119b<sup>26</sup>) **אמר ר' יהושע בן לוי כל העונה יהא שמיא רבא מברך בכל כחו קורעין לו גזר דינו של שבעים שנה . . . ר' חייא בר אבא אמר ר' יוחנן אפילו יש בו שמץ של עבודה זרה מוחלין לו**. "R. Joshua b. Levi says that the evil decree is annulled for him who utters this response with complete devotion. R. Yohanan adds that even if he has leant towards idolatry, he is forgiven."

The reason for this importance must be something more than the implied presence of the people in the synagogue and lecture room (Appendix B), and to get a clear idea of what this response is, it is necessary to go back a little.

The expression **קרא בשם ה'**<sup>2</sup> apparently means to use the Name of God in prayer, and the Talmud (Sota 10a<sup>1</sup>), with true insight, understands **אל עולם ויקרא שם בשם ה'** (Gen 21 33) as **וַיִּקְרֵא** 'he made others call upon and praise God.' This inducing others to utter

<sup>1</sup> The **מעשה מרכבה** Ezek 1 and **מעשה בראשית** Gen 1 were made the subjects of mystical and theosophical speculation, that was to be entered into only by those exceptionally qualified, and then to be studied intensely and with the utmost care and gravity.

<sup>2</sup> Gen 4 26 12 8 13 4 21 33 etc.



praise to Heaven was always considered especially meritorious, and the use of a summons<sup>3</sup> and response<sup>4</sup> in the Old Testament is far more frequent than would appear at first sight. Of the old method of reciting the Psalms we know very little, but we can work backwards from the scattered notices of later times to obtain some results.

In the various notices as to how the Song of Moses may have been sung at the Red Sea, we learn incidentally that there were various ways in which the Hallel (Ps 113—118) was recited, the Minhag differing in different places and on various occasions. The Mishna<sup>5</sup> tells us that there was some sort of doubling. The Tosefta<sup>6</sup> seems to refer to two methods, in one the congregation repeats the opening words, in the other they complete the verse started by the leader. The Talmud<sup>7</sup> makes the congregation repeat the opening phrase and so on. The construction of the Hallel Psalms shows traces of various forms of recitation. In Ps 118 1—4 the response

<sup>3</sup> E. g. הללויה Psalms, הללויה Neh 9 5 Jud 5 2. The congregational being the summons (in Ps 106 48 it really belongs to Ps 107 1 cf. Pes 117a g (הללויה ראש פרקא).

<sup>4</sup> Ps 118 1—4 29 כי לעולם חסדו, הללויה and the various responses to Ps 136 1 Chr 16 34 41 2 Chr 5 13 etc. <sup>5</sup> Succah 3 11.

<sup>6</sup> T. Sota 6 3 303 19 ענין אחריו ענין ראשון. משה אמר אומר עזי וישראל אומרין עזי וישראל אומרין אשירה לה'. משה אמר עזי וישראל אומרין אשירה לה'. משה פותח תחילה וישראל אומרין אחריו ונומרים. משה אמר אז ישר משה וישראל אומר אשירה לה'. משה אמר עזי וישראל אומר זה אלי ואנוהו. משה אמר ה' איש מלחמה וישראל אומר ה' שמו

כגדול המקרא את הלל והן עונין אחריו ראשי פרקים. משה אמר B. Sota 30b 20 אשירה לה' והן אומרים אשירה לה'. (משה אמר כי נאה נאה והן אומרים אשירה לה'). משה אמר אמר רבא הילכתא גיברתא 1 B. Succa 38b. עזי וישראל אומרין אשירה לה' איכא למשמע ממנהא דהלילא הוא אומר הללויה והן אומרים הללויה (מכאן שמצוה לענות הללויה). הוא אומר הללו עבדי ה' והן אומרין הללויה (מכאן שאם היה גדול מקרא אתו עונה אחריו הללויה). הוא אומר הודו לה' והן אומרים הודו לה' (מכאן שמצוה לענות ראשי פרקים). קמן מקרא אותו עונין אחריו מה שהוא אומר. הוא אמר אנא ה' הצליחה נא והן אומרים כך (מכאן Cf. J. Sota 5 6 20c 7. שאם בא לכפול כופל). הוא אמר ברוך הבא והן אומרים בשם ה' and Mechilta of R. Simeon b. Yohai p. 57. Maimonides, Yad ha Hazaqa (Hilchoth Hanucah 3 6 end) says that the invariable response of old used to be הללויה, in all 128 times (cf. J. Shab 16 15c 30) משונות מנהגות משונות. The Shema' was recited antiphonally in the synagogues—פרס על שמע (Dr. ELBOGEN, JQR. XVIII (1906) 588ff.). T. Pes 10 6 172 21 אצלן והוא אינו הולך אצלן is therefore also a reference to the difference of custom that existed.

was the second half of the verse **כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסִדוֹ** as in Ps 136.<sup>8</sup> But from verse 5 onwards, the doubling of the verses seems to point to antiphonal recitation of the parallel verses [Appendix E p. 112]. Applying this last scheme to Psalm 113 we get the summons of the reader (**מְקַרָּא**) in verse 1 **ה' הִלְלוּ אֶת שֵׁם ה'** and in answer to this summons to praise God's Name, the response **יְהִי שֵׁם** **יְהוָה מְבֹרָךְ** **וְעַד עוֹלָם**. This verse, equivalent in substance to the Kaddish response, is of frequent occurrence in varying forms in the Old Testament. In 1 K 10 9 = 2 Chr 9 8 **יְהִי ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ בָרוּךְ** and Job 1 21 **יְהִי שֵׁם ה' מְבֹרָךְ** we find traces of it, and in the opening of Daniel's prayer (Dan 2 20 cf. Tobit 9 5) the Aramaic form of it **לְהוֹנָא שְׁמָה דִּי-אלהא מְבֹרָךְ מִן עַלְמָא וְעַד עַלְמָא**.

Further, in a well known Midrash on Jacob's blessing<sup>9</sup>, Jacob's sons are pictured as assuring him of their belief in God's unity in the words **יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ ה' אֶחָד** (Deut 6 4) to which he answers **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד מַלְכוּתוֹ לְעוֹלָם וְעַד**. In the old version preserved in the Targum, his response of praise is given in the Aramaic form **יְהוָה שְׁמִיהּ רַבָּא מְבֹרָךְ לְעַלְמֵי עַלְמִין**<sup>10</sup>. This shows the substantial unity of the Temple response **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד מַלְכוּתוֹ לְעוֹלָם וְעַד** with the response here in the Kaddish. **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד** (Dt 6 4 J I; note 10 supra), and **יְהוָה שְׁמִיהּ רַבָּא**, are, as we have seen (p. 30f.) simply substitutes for the Name of God. **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד** is used in the nearly related summons (Neh 9 5) **יְהוָה בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה ה' אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִן הָעוֹלָם וְעַד הָעוֹלָם וְיִבְרַכְנוּ שֵׁם כְּבוֹדְךָ . . .** (cf. Deut 28 58 **הַשֵּׁם הַנִּכְבָּד**). So **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד מַלְכוּתוֹ**, correctly construed as "Blessed be His glorious sovereign Name",<sup>11</sup> is seen to be merely **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד**, more generously strengthened with two words<sup>12</sup> in place of the usual one.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Psalm 135 and 136 are the same Psalm constructed for two differing forms of response. Further 1 Chr 16 34 41 2 Chr 5 13 Ps 118 29.

<sup>9</sup> Sifre Deut 6 4 p. 72b Pes 56a <sup>20</sup> Gen. Rab 98 to וְיָחִי, beginning, Tanhuma ib. p. 109a Deut. Rab 2 JELL., BH. II 73 Genesis 49 1 J II Deut 6 4 J I and J II.

<sup>10</sup> Deut 6 4 J II **יְהוָה שְׁמִיהּ רַבָּא מְבֹרָךְ לְעַלְמֵי עַלְמִין**. Gen 49 1 J I has the synonymous **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד** for **יְהוָה שְׁמִיהּ רַבָּא**. So Deut 6 4 J I **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד מַלְכוּתוֹ**.

<sup>11</sup> Ges.-Kautzsch, *Hebr. Gram.*<sup>27</sup> 135 n.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד מַלְכוּתוֹ** Ps 145 11 **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד מַלְכוּתוֹ** etc. p. 30f. Exod 33 22 **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד מַלְכוּתוֹ**.

<sup>13</sup> **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד מַלְכוּתוֹ** (כְּבוֹד), **יְהוָה שֵׁם כְּבוֹד מַלְכוּתוֹ** (קְדוּשָׁה) etc. Cf. L. BLAU, *REJ.* XXXI 1895 p. 188f.

We are now in a position to see the identity of this response, at bottom made up of 3 parts<sup>14</sup> (1) ברוך (2) ה' (3) לעולם, in the various liturgical passages in the Old Testament in which it occurs.

Temple Response	Kaddish	Dan 2 20	Ps 113 2	1 Chr 29 10	Ps 106 48 1 Chr 16 36	Ps 41 14	Ps 72 19	Ps 89 52
ברוך	יהא...מברך	להוא...מברך	יהי...מברך	ברוך אתה	ברוך	ברוך	ברוך	ברוך
שם כבוד מלכותו	שמה רבא	שמה די אלהא	שם ה'	ה' אלהי ישראל אבינו	ה' אלהי ישראל	ה' אלהי ישראל	שם כבודו	ה'
לעולם ועד	לעלם ולעלמי עלמיא	מן עלמא ועד עלמא	מעתה ועד עולם	מעולם ועד עולם	מן העולם ועד העולם	מהעולם ועד העולם	לעולם	לעולם

Even the form of summons is sometimes of the same type: Ps 145 21 לעולם ועד (γ) שם קדשו (β) [כל בשר] (α) or Neh 9 5 ברכו (α) את ה' אלהיכם (γ) מן העולם ועד העולם (β). It is here seen that all the doxologies closing the books of Psalms, perhaps also recited after every Psalm,<sup>15</sup> are substantially the same, and that *this one type of blessing runs through the liturgical Psalms and prayers of the Old Testament*. It seems not improbable that a formula of this type may be meant by the enigmatic השיר ברכת (Pes 10 7) recorded as said over the Hallel, the meaning of which was no longer known to the Tannaim of the second century. The formula is a simple blessing of God's Name). In the Psalm doxologies it was said by the leader, the people responding (Ps 106 48 = 1 Chr 16 36 ואמר כל העם (ואמן) אמן. So too in the ancient fast day service<sup>16</sup> the leader said the blessings or Psalms and closed with the doxology ברוך ה' אלהי ישראל מן העולם ועד העולם (Ps 106 48 1 Chr 16 36) to which the congregation in the Temple answered שם כבוד ברוך, in the synagogues (ואמן) אמן.

The difference between the Temple and synagogue responses is due to the fact that within the Temple, the Tetragrammaton was spoken, outside its pronunciation was avoided. This prepares us for the fact which we learn from other sources,<sup>17</sup> that ברוך שם

<sup>14</sup> Similar to the frequent Palmyrene dedication לעלמא לברין שמה. The Mechilta 16 p. 19b gives the response of the people as המבורך לעולם. ברוך ה' המבורך לעולם.

<sup>15</sup> So GRAETZ, *MGWJ*. 1872 p. 481 ff.

<sup>16</sup> T. Taan 1 10—14 215 26 ff. B. Taan 16b.

<sup>17</sup> Yoma 38 4 1 2 62 Ta'an 2 5 T. Ta'an 1 10 f. 13 215 29 216 3. Mechilta l.c. Gen.



כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד was a response to the utterance of the Tetragrammaton in the Temple. Bearing this fact in mind, we shall arrive at a clearer understanding of the nature of the Kaddish response.

In the Tanna d'be Eliahu Rabba the phrase יהי שמו הגדול occurs 23 times, in the Tanna d'be Eliahu Zutta once. Ten of these are tacked on to הקב"ה,<sup>18</sup> 9 to אבי(נו),<sup>19</sup> 2 to שבשמים,<sup>19</sup> and one each to יושב על כסא שופט צדק<sup>20</sup> and מלך מלכי המלכים ברוך הוא.<sup>21</sup> This insertion of the praise at a mention of a name of God is not for special emphasis, but occurs quite sporadically and after designations that already contain the interjection ברוך הוא, and there seems to be no reason why it should be limited to just these cases. There is every reason to think that the response was often used in one form or another as an ejaculated praise at the mention of God's Name. For we have seen that it is the equivalent of ברוך שם, which is unquestionably a response to the Name, and both are in form simply blessings of the Name. Moreover we have direct evidence that responses were given at every mention of God, as in the later phraseology of Rabbinic writers יהי שמו הגדול (ה) or the liturgical יהי שמו הגדול וברוך שמו הגדול are added. Deut 32 3 כי שם ה' אקרא הבו גרל לאלהינו was interpreted as "When I mention the Name of the Lord, ascribe greatness to our God".<sup>22</sup> Prov 10 7 זכר צדיק לברכה was taken as prescribing a ברכה at the mention of the Righteous One.<sup>23</sup> Hence the added המבורך according to R. Ishmael Ber 7 3 in the formula opening a service רבנו את ה'

אף הוא פירש בשפתיו ואמר ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד where פירש בשפתיו means uttered the שם המפורש—the Name distinctly pronounced, the Tetragrammaton. This explains the otherwise enigmatic notice אין עונין אמן T. Ber 7 17 11 T. Ta'an 1 11 215 28 J. Ber 9 5 14c<sup>12</sup> B. Ta'an 16b<sub>12</sub> Sota 40b<sup>1</sup>. In the Temple the longer formula כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד was used, in the synagogues אמן (ואמן).

<sup>18</sup> TBER. 2 11 7 32 8 39 18 109 20 113 25 136 27 143 29 156. TBEZ. after מלך מלכי המלכים הקב"ה 4 180.

<sup>19</sup> 7 33 אבינו שבשמים TBER. 10 51 11 53 17 83 18 100 20 121 29 157. <sup>20</sup> TBER. 5 25 12 56. <sup>21</sup> TBER. 4 18 17 84 84. 20 115 (not immediately).

<sup>22</sup> Sifre to Deut 32 3 306 p. 132b towards end, Rashi. Cf. Ber. 45a, Mechilta l. c. reads שם ה' אקרא. זה המבורך. הבו גרל לאלהינו, אלו העונים אחריי. ומה הן עונין אמן.

<sup>23</sup> Yoma 37a<sup>10</sup> Yalkut to Prov 10 7 Mechilta l. c.

המבורך (p. 51). The custom that these verses were made to support was not regarded as tedious,<sup>24</sup> for various responses were given,<sup>25</sup> sometimes inordinately heaped up such as (TBER. 17 84) אבל הקדוש [ברוך הוא מלך מלכי המלכים ברוך הוא יהי שמו הגדול מבורך לעולם ולעולמי שנתגלה מלך מלכי המלכים הקדוש ברוך or עולמים] אינו כן שנתגלה מלך מלכי המלכים הקדוש ברוך הוא יהי שמו הגדול מבורך לעולם ולעולמי עולמים. The response to the opening summons ברוך ה' המבורך לעולם ועד was ברכו את ה' המבורך and ברוך ה' המבורך לעולם ועד (Sifre, Mechilta l. c.). The response in the grace after meals was ברוך המבורך DS. (Texts ברוך ומבורך, Tosafoth ברוך הוא ומבורך Ber 45 b 7. The frequent designation המקום (Abot 5 4), especially in the blessing המקום ברוך, has almost invariably ברוך הוא tacked on to it; and when it occurs without it, the praise was certainly added in actual recitation and is merely omitted in writing to avoid repetition, just as in early Church writings the doxology closing the Paternoster is often left to be supplied in reading, and as, according to GRAETZ (l. c.), doxologies were recited after each Psalm, but written only at the end of whole books. In this way we can explain the rare cases where קדשא or הקדוש occurs without an added praise.<sup>26</sup> It occurs with added praises as follows:

- (1) קדשא בריך הוא = הקדוש ברוך הוא  
(blessed is, or rather blessed be He)
- (2) קדשא יהא שמיה מברך<sup>27</sup>
- (3) קדשא בריך הוא יהא שמיה משובח<sup>28</sup>
- (4) קדשא יהא שמיה מברך לעלמי<sup>29</sup>
- (5) קדשא בריך הוא יהא שמיה רבא מברך ומשבח לעלם<sup>30</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Deut 27 15—26. Cf. the 123 הללויה responses p. 44 note 7.

<sup>25</sup> Romans 1 25 and (?) 9 5.

<sup>26</sup> Exod 32 19 J I Num 23 20 J I Deut 32 3 J II Lam 3 38 Cant 4 11. In these cases however קדשא could be genitive in place of the adjective e. g. Deut 32 3 J II קדשא equal to שמיה קדשא as commonly in Aramaic. פום קדשא as in Exod 32 19 J I is the translation of the commonly occurring פ' used to avoid פ' ה' (See the examples collected by BACHER, *ETT.* 168f. and Addenda ETA. p. 254.) But for this also פ' הקב"ה occurs.

<sup>27</sup> Exod 20 2 3 J II Num 16 2 J I.

<sup>28</sup> Exod 15 18 J I 24 18 J I Num 21 34 J II Deut 3 2 J II.

<sup>29</sup> Exod 15 3 J I.

<sup>30</sup> Exod 20 2 J II.



(6)  $\overline{\text{אלהא דעלמא}}$  יהא שמיא מברך לעלמי  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{עלמא} \\ \text{עלמין} \end{array} \right\}$ <sup>31</sup>

(7)  $\overline{\text{קודשא}}$  יהא שמיא רבא מברך לעלמי עלמין<sup>32</sup>

(8)  $\overline{\text{קודשא}}$  יהא שמיא רבא מברך לעלם ולעלמי עלמין<sup>33</sup>

(9)  $\overline{\text{הקדוש}}$  ברוך הוא [מלך מלכי המלכים ברוך הוא] יהי שמו הגדול מבורך לעולם ולעולמי עולמים<sup>34</sup>

(10)  $\overline{\text{הקדוש}}$  ברוך הוא יתברך שמו לעולם ולעולמי עולמין<sup>35</sup>

(11)  $\overline{\text{הקדוש}}$  ברוך הוא שיתברך שמו של הקדוש ברוך הוא לעולם ולעולמי עולמים<sup>36</sup>

etc. etc.<sup>37</sup>

These examples leave no doubt that it was customary to respond at the mention of God's Name with a blessing, varying in form, but at bottom composed of the same three elements as the Biblical responses examined above with the Kaddish response, namely (1) בריך (2) אוכרה, הוכרה, וְכָר, (3) לעלם. These are all responses to a זְכוּרָה, a mention of God's Name, given by the reader and the congregation.<sup>38</sup> It is clear therefore, that this response in the Kaddish is the liturgical response of the Bible, and the praise ejaculated in the synagogues and study houses after every mention of God's Name.

<sup>31</sup> Gen 35 9 J II Haftarah Targum blessing LAGARDE, *Proph. Chald.* 1872 p. 493 no. 8. <sup>32</sup> Gen 49 1 J II Ex 15 18 J II edd.

<sup>33</sup> Exod 15 3 J II as in the Kaddish. <sup>34</sup> TBER. 17 84 and p. 47 note 18.

<sup>35</sup> TBER. 18 108.

<sup>36</sup> TBER. 28 149.

<sup>37</sup> Compare CHASE (*The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church* p. 168 et seq.) for the various ways in which the doxology  $\sigma\theta\iota\varsigma$  [ἐξ ὁμολογίας] ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας was expanded in the Christian Church. Ps 113 2 appears as a response in the early Church liturgy e. g. in the Mass of St. Chrysostom Brit. Mus. Add. 14497. Cf. PROBST, *Liturgie des vierten Jahrhunderts*, p. 443.

<sup>38</sup> Exod 23 13 וְשָׁם אֱלֹהִים אַחֲרָיִם לֹא תִזְכְּרוּ. Exod 3 15 וְהָיָה שְׁמִי לְעֵלֶם וְהָיָה זִכְרִי לְדֹר וָדֹר. "name" mention. Cf. Assyr. zakāru to name, mention, zikru a name. Cf. further Exod 17 14 Isa 26 8 Hos 12 6 Ps 6 6 30 5 34 17 97 12 102 13 135 13 Prov 10 7 Job 18 17. אוכרה, הוכרה, etc. are prob. shortened from השם, הוכרת, הוכרה, etc. and sometimes refer to other designations of God besides 'ה. BACHER, *ETT.* 186 ff.

<sup>39</sup> DALMAN, therefore, Gram. p. 26 is at fault in finding a sign of the Palestinian origin of the Kaddish in the quotation of the response in the Palestinian Sifre l. c. The response is, as shown above, Biblical. Hence also FRIEDMANN is totally mistaken in writing of this response (Intro. to TBE. p. 79 bot.) נראה שענינה גורם לטעות. i. e. in the time of Joshua b. Levi and Jose (3rd cent. CE.).



From the variety of responses, Biblical and postbiblical, all of the same type, it is impossible to speak of a fixed custom. But the response in the Aggada seems to have been as a rule **יהא שמיה רבא מברך** [לעלם ולעלמי עלמא]<sup>40</sup>. The references to this response in the Talmud are to a well known and popular formula and the necessity is not felt of explaining what is meant by it. The passages A B E H I K L (pp. 8f. 43 and 50) may refer not alone to the final doxology but to the constant response given throughout an Aggadic address. The reference seems to be rather to a response that was frequent in the people's mouth than to the one final one as is always assumed. But where, as in C . . **יהא אמן עונין** and D F . . **אמן אחריו אמן יהי**, introduces it, the reference to the Kaddish found in these passages is probably correct.

According to the Sifre l. c. **מנין לאומר יהא שמיה ר' יוסי אומר . . מנין לאומר יהא שמיה רבא מברך** שעונים אחריהם לעולמי ולעולמי עולמים? תלמוד לומר כי שם ה' אקרא, the leader added the first half of the praise to an utterance of God's Name and the congregation followed it up with **לע' ולע' על'**. Assuming the text here to be correct,<sup>41</sup> it would nevertheless seem that the *final* response in the Kaddish doxology was given in toto by the congregation, the leader prompting **אמן יהא שמיה רבא** and the congregation answering **אמן**.

There is no mention of God's Name in the Kaddish to occasion this response other than **יהא שמיה רבא**. The emphasis however is on this magnifying and hallowing of the Name through the redemption,<sup>42</sup> and in response to this as a finale, the whole response is given in full by the assembled congregation. To magnify it above the other (less complete?) responses given throughout the discourse, the Midrashic amplification of it . . **יתברך וישתבח** was added.

There is one more Talmudic reference to this formula. In Succa 39a<sup>2</sup> (L) Raba (280—352) says one should not separate

<sup>40</sup> Sota 49a<sup>26</sup> Compare also C D E F page 8f.

<sup>41</sup> Note however **אומר** (Sing.) and **אחריהם** (Pl.)—"after these mentions"?; Aramaic and Hebrew **לעולמי (!) ולעולמי עולמים** **יהא שמיה רבא מברך**.

<sup>42</sup> The intervening **מלכות** clause is not felt as interrupting; compare TBER. 20 115 **אבינו שבשמים, ששמינו כשמו ושמו נאה לו והכל שלו והכל מעשי ידיו יהי שמו תגדל** **מבורך**.

לא from מברך, but should utter the four words ישר"מ together: לימא אינש יהא שמיא רבא והדר מברך אלא יהא שמיא רבא מברך בהרדי. This is apparently directed against a scheme of response: Reader יהא שמיא רבא—Cong. 'יהא ש' ר' מברך לע' ול' על'. similar to the summons of Akiba (Ber 7 3) ברוכו את ה'. To these were preferred the schemes: Reader יה' ש' רב' מב' לע' ול' על'—Cong. 'יהא ש' רב' מברך על' and Reader ברוך ה' המבורך לעולם ועד—Cong. ברוכו את ה' המבורך<sup>43</sup> emphasising the importance of responding to the utterance of the Name.

The relationship of the Kaddish and the summons ברוכו which we find as interchangeable in various passages<sup>44</sup> is, as we now see, the relationship of their responses to each other. The two responses יה' ש' רב' מב' לע' ול' על' and ברוך ה' המבורך לעולם ועד, both of which are supported from Deut 32 3 in the same way, are similar in form and are responses to the mention of the divine Name. For the response ברוך ה' המבורך לעולם ועד is *not* the answer to the summons to prayer, but a response to the utterance of the Name contained in the summons.<sup>45</sup> These considerations help towards understanding the importance attached to these responses.<sup>46</sup> *They not only imply the presence of the congregation in the synagogue or study house, but are the praise of God offered after every blessing,<sup>47</sup> after every mention of His Name and after the final doxology of the lecture house.*

The response must, from the analogy of the various Biblical and Rabbinical forms adduced above, end at עלמיא.<sup>48</sup> Through a misconstruction and to preserve the number seven of 'the seven praises', many texts<sup>49</sup> include also the יתברך of the following paragraph

<sup>43</sup> R. Ishmael Ber 7 3 Sifre l. c. Ber 50a 11.

<sup>44</sup> Soferim 10 8 p. 153 ברוכו בין קריש 18 8. The Akiba legend (Appendix B note 3 p. 102) where the son says ברוכו או קריש. Compare the Kaddish like prayer added as a meditation to ברוכו in almost all prayer manuals.

<sup>45</sup> The text of Sifre l. c. emphasising שם in Deut 32 3 makes this clear. This answers the doubt expressed by Dr. ELBOGEN *JQR.* XIX 1907 p. 235.

<sup>46</sup> Shulḥan Aruch Oraḥ Ḥayyim 56 3 (באר היטב): אמן יהא שמיא רבא עריף מפי: מקדושה ומורים

<sup>47</sup> Sifre l. c. מנין שעונים אחר המבורך.

<sup>48</sup> So Seadya, Asheri, Rashi, Maḥzor Vitry, Maimonides, Kol Bo etc.

<sup>49</sup> Amram, Orḥoth Ḥayyim, Shulḥan 'Aruch Oraḥ Ḥayyim 56 3, Spanish, many Yemen MSS. (Or. 1480 etc.). The legend in Derech Eres Zutṭa as cited in Shibbole ha-Leḳeṭ 8. Ha-Manhig Ch. 4 etc. The Cabbalists Joseph Gikatilla, Baḥye ben Asher and Recanate quoted in Maṭṭeh Moshe 74.



in the response. This reading is construed as two sentences **יהא** **ולעלמי עלמא יתברך** and **שמיה רבא מברך לעלם**. This is apparently the meaning of the reading **יהא שמיה רבא מברך לעלמא ולעלמי עלמא** in a Genizah fragment,<sup>50</sup> and certainly that of the Italian<sup>51</sup> and Provençal<sup>52</sup> reading **יהא שמיה רבא מברך לעלם ולעלמי עלמא ולעלמי**. The Carpentras and Chinese rituals divide the words: **יהא שמיה רבא מברך**. **לעלם לעל' עלמ'** and **יתברך** and the Maḥzor Vitry<sup>53</sup> in understanding **יהא שמיה רבא מברך** (**הבא**) obscures the true meaning of the verse.

**יהא** Superlinear wrongly **יהא**, perhaps from the influence of the irregular **א**, (usually standing for *ā*), in place of the expected Yod (from the root **יהה** not **היה** BARTH, *ES.* 1893 71f.) that as mater lectionis implies an *î* or *ê*. The **א** is perhaps also used here to avoid reading the Hebrew form **יהי**. Nabatean and Biblical Aramaic generally write *tertia* **א** in the 3rd sing. impf. of *tertia* **א**, **י** and **ו**. In later Aramaic **יהי** and **יהא** occur indifferently.

The superlinear texts read here **יהא**. In the paragraph **על יהוי שלמא** they read almost invariably **יהוי (להון)** and again **יהוי שלמא**. There is no apparent reason for this regularly occurring variation in form.<sup>54</sup>

**לעלם ולעלמי עלמא** Thus in the Kaddish response,<sup>55</sup> or without the connecting Vav. The readings **עלמא** for **עלמי** in Kohut's Yemen text<sup>56</sup> and **לעלמא** for **לעלם** in two Genizah fragments<sup>57</sup> and in the Yemen text of Maimonides' reading<sup>58</sup> are exceptional. The numerous variations shown above (p. 48f.) could easily be multiplied from

<sup>50</sup> GDK. 54.

<sup>51</sup> LUZZATTO 40b. Or. 2736 Add. 18,230, 26,957, 27,072 etc. for the sabbath morning service.

<sup>52</sup> Cod. GASTER 701.

<sup>53</sup> Tosafoth Ber 3a.

<sup>54</sup> **יהוי** and **יהא** are quite similar in usage. Compare Onk. and J I to Gen 16 12 and 18 18 where **יהי** corresponds with **יהוי** and vice versa. Aramaic inscriptions show **יהוי**, **יהא** and **יהוא** LDZB. 259. The Biblical Aramaic form **להוא**, occurring occasionally in the Targumim (Exod 22 24 JI, Ezek 41 6, Exod 10 28 JIII, GINSB. (למהוי) is not found in Kaddish texts. On the forms see DG 264. 352 ff. NÖLD. *Mand.* p. 215 ff. § 166, p. 267 § 196. KÖNIG *ZDMG.* LI 1897, 332 et seq. BARTH *ES.* 1893 71 f. BEVAN, *Daniel* 35 f. etc.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Ber 28b 23. Targ. Exod 15 3 J II.

<sup>56</sup> Targ. Ps 45 18.

<sup>57</sup> GDK. 53. 54 and Chinese MSS. Cf. Isa 45 17 Cod. Reuchl. Targ.

<sup>58</sup> Or. 2227 p. 18b.



Biblical usage,<sup>59</sup> Aramaic inscriptions,<sup>60</sup> the Targum<sup>61</sup> and other sources. In view of these differences, the notice of the Mishna and Tosefta is instructive "עד עולם" כל חותמי ברכות שבמקדש היו משקללו המינין ואמרו אין העולם אלא אחד התקינו שיהיו אומרים "מן העולם ועד העולם".<sup>62</sup> "The final words of the Temple blessings used to be 'for ever'; but in opposition to the sectaries who denied the existence of a second world, the formula was expanded to 'for ever and to all eternity.'" This notice can hardly be wholly true historically, as both the simple לעולם<sup>63</sup> and the fuller עולם (ה) עולם (ו) עד (ה) עולם (ו) מן (ו) occur in Biblical doxologies. The sectaries (מינין) meant must be Sadducees (or Samaritans?) as the existence of the Temple alone precludes any later reference. The Sadducee Sirach uses the form עולם ועד עולם (39 20). But the oldest Samaritan texts have only לעולם.<sup>65</sup> The double reading however עולם ועד העולם (T. Ta'an 1 11 215 28) used in the Temple is always reproduced traditionally in the Targum as מן עלמא הדין ועד עלמא דאתי. And a comparison of this notice of the Mishna and Tosefta with a passage like the Targ. to Isa 41 4 אנא ה' ברית עֲלֵמָא—(אני ה' ראשון ואת אחרנים אני הוא) מבראשית ואף עֲלֵמִי עֲלֵמִיָּא דילי אינון shows the transference of meaning from עולם eternity to עלמא world, and makes clear the traditional reference to the present eternity-world and the future world-eternity expressed in the formula לעלמי עלמיא . . .

<sup>59</sup> Ps 72 19 90 2 41 14 145 2 etc. Dan 2 20 עד עלמא מן עלמא ועד עלמא Dan 7 18 עד עלמא ועד עלמא עלמיא.

<sup>60</sup> Palmyrene עלמא. SAYCE-COWLEY Egyptian Aram. על 9 times. LDZB. 342 לעלם עלמין.

<sup>61</sup> Isa 6 3 edd. לעלם ולעלמי עלמיא. Cod. Reuchl. בעלם עלמיא. Abud. Amr. Sead. Kimhi עלמי עלמיא. Abraham ibn Ezra לעלם עלמיא עלמיא.

<sup>62</sup> Ber. end. T. Ber. 7 21 17 8 חותמי is a noun, pl. cstr. of חותם, not of חותם. The Mishna text reads less suitably מן העולם והיו. <sup>63</sup> Ps 72 19 89 53.

<sup>64</sup> Ps 41 14 106 48 1 Chr 16 36 29 10. Compare Dan 2 20.

<sup>65</sup> E. g. Add. 19,651 לעולם וברוך שמו לעולם ולעלמי (ו) לעולם וברוך שמו לעולם. HEIDENHEIM X Samarit. Liturgie Heft 1. GEIGER Urschrift 128 ff.

(1) יְתַבְרֶךְ (2) וַיִּשְׁתַּבַּח (3) וַיִּתְפָּאֵר (4) וַיְהַרְמֵם (5) וַיִּתְנַשֵּׂא (6) וַיִּתְהַדָּר  
 (7) וַיִּתְעַלֶּה } (8a) וַיִּתְהַלֵּל  
 } (8b) וַיִּתְקַלֵּם  
 וַתִּשְׁבַּחְתָּהּ וַנְחַמְתָּהּ רָאִמִּירָן בַּעֲלָמָא וַאֲמַרו אָמֵן.

Yemen reads 1 2 3 4 7 6 8a 5. Roman, Romania, Corfu and Provence 1 2 3 4 5 7 6 8a, and Chinese 1 2 3 4 7 5 6 8. Rashi, Yemen, Chinese, Roman and Provence לעלא לעלא and so German from the 1st to the 10th of Tishri.

Stripped of its richness of wording this paragraph may be reduced to ברכתא מכל לעלא ב"ה לעלא דקדשא שמה דקדשא, and it is seen to be a florid Midrashic working out of the response 'הא שמ' רב' מברך, apparently suggested in form by the opening words 'הא שמ' רב' מברך, intended to magnify the finale and make it more impressive.

This paragraph is therefore younger than its original. PHIL. BLOCH<sup>1</sup> dates it from the Gaonic period, the style, according to him, pointing decidedly to the mystics known as the *יוורי מרכבה* as the authors of this addition. In proof of his theory he refers to the manual of these mystics—the work *היכלות רבתי*<sup>2</sup> that contains many passages of heaped up synonyms of praise more or less similar to those in this paragraph.<sup>3</sup> Their relationship cannot be gainsaid. But in the *היכלות רבתי* they show a mystic extravagance and unclearness of expression that is foreign to the Kaddish paragraph. Many of them are expansions of expansions like the acrostic one in Amram (I 3b). מי לא יאדיר למלך האדיר. מי לא יברך למלך המברך. מי לא ירומם למלך המרומם. מי לא יהדר למלך המהדר. מי לא ימליך למלך המלכים. . . and as such betray themselves as belonging to a very late stage of the tendency.

<sup>1</sup> MGWJ. XXXVII 1893 p. 264 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> JELL. BH. III 83—108.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. Ch. 16 3 p. 95 ומהרין ומהרין ומהרין כבוד; ותפארת וגדלה למוטוסא ה" לפניך יברכו לפניך ישבחו לפניך יפארו לפניך ירוממו Ch 247 p. 102; ותפארת וגדלה למוטוסא ה" לתאדור תהדר תתרום תתנשא תתפאר תתברך תשתבח תתגדל תתקדש תתעלה תתעלו תתקלם .. Ch 26 6 p. 103; תתהדר תתרום תתנשא מלך מפור .. Ch 72 p. 89, 12 3 p. 92; לפניך ידור ... תתהדר בכל שיר, תתפאר בכל נועם, תתרום על היכל נאוד, תתנשא Ch. 24 p. 102; תתקדש על עטורי פאר, תתגבר בכל המעשים, תתנאה על כל יצורים, תתכבד על כסא כבודך, תתיקר על כלי חמדתך, תתברך בכל הברכות, תשתבח בכל התושבחות, תתהלל בכל ההילול, תתקלם בכל הרגנות, תתגדל לעולמים, תתקדש עדי עד ...

With far more right could the author of the TBER be fixed upon as author of our paragraph. For in that work instead of praises sometimes over 80 in number piled one upon another as in *יברך וישבח וירומם ויגדל*, we get the more modest phrase *היכלות רבתי יקדש* in different variations over and over again.<sup>4</sup>

The almost complete agreement in the wording of the paragraph in every ritual points to its having been old and traditional long before the Gaonic period [7th—11th cent.]. The subsequent paragraphs dating from late Talmudic or Gaonic times, show many variations in their traditions. Of this paragraph there is only one tradition and that is shared by every rite. And this early date is borne out entirely by the praises on which BLOCH bases his theory. *Hechaloth Rabbathi* itself contains elements far older than Gaonic. BLOCH himself refers to the case mentioned in both Talmuds<sup>5</sup> where a synagogue reader in Tannaitic times is blamed for departing from the traditionally fixed form by heaping up praise designations over and above *האל הגדול הנבור והנורא*<sup>6</sup> incorporated by the Men of the Great Synagogue in the *Shemone 'Esre*. This, if it shows nothing else, proves that the tendency towards piling up synonyms of praise existed earlier than the Gaonic *מרכבה*. The same is attested by the rain blessing twice given in the Palestinian Talmud<sup>7</sup> beginning *יתגדל (ו) יתקדש (ו) יתברך (ו) יתרום שמך מלכנו . . .* *ישראל מפארין ומרוממין ומשבחין ומקלסין ומהללין* of R. Simeon b. Yoḥai<sup>8</sup> *... (ומהדרין) ונותנין שיר ושבח גדולה ותפארת ונצח והוד למי . . . מרומם ומשבח ונותן שיר ושבח והודאה וגדלה* of R. Ishmael<sup>9</sup> *מפארים ומרוממים ונותנין שיר ושבח וגדולה ותפארת למי . . . ותפארת והוד והלל . . .*

<sup>4</sup> TBER. 5 22 6 31 31, 15 69 16 81 18 96 97 (6 times in twelve lines) 103. Compare further 18 89 29 157 19 110 6 27 17 83 20 113 28 154 18 100.

<sup>5</sup> B. Ber 33b<sub>12</sub> B. Meg 25a<sup>21</sup> Jer Ber 9 1 12d<sub>31</sub> Midr. Ps 19 2 ed. BUBER p. 168.

<sup>6</sup> Deut 10 17 Neh 9 32 Ber 33b<sub>12</sub> Meg 25a<sup>21</sup> Yoma 69b<sub>16</sub> J. Ber 9 1 12d<sub>31</sub> Sifre 343 ed. FRIEDMANN p. 142b Midr. Ps 19 2 p. 163.

<sup>7</sup> J. Ber 9 3 14a<sup>8</sup> J. Ta'an 1 3 64b<sup>12</sup> Ber Rab 13.

<sup>8</sup> Mechilta of R. Simeon b. Yoḥai ed. HOFFMANN to Exod 14 8 p. 45, to Exod 14 14 p. 47.

<sup>9</sup> Mechilta of R. Ishmael (ed. FRIEDMANN) to Exod 14 15 end p. 30a, to Exod 14 14 p. 29a. See ZUNZ GV<sup>2</sup> 387 note ii.



to say nothing of Biblical examples<sup>10</sup> such as *משבח ומרומם ומהדר*,<sup>11</sup> *לך ה' הגדלה והנבירה והתפארת והנצח וההוד . . . לך ה' . . .* 1 Chr 29 11. *הממלכה והמתנשא לכל לראש . . .* The very maxim of R. Meir (139—165). *“few should be לעולם יהיו דבריו של אדם מועטין לפני הקדוש ברוך הוא”* (Ber 61a<sup>1</sup> Eccl 5 1), of R. Yohanan (Job 37 20) *המספר בשבתו של הקב"ה יותר מדאי נעקר מן העולם שנאמר* *“he who gives God immoderate praise, destroys himself”* and other similar sayings, must be understood as showing that the opposite tendency was prevalent, and against it they warn.

The Mishna Pesahim 10 5 in our Babylonian editions contains the following words *לפיכך אנחנו חייבים להודות להלל לשבח לפאר לרומם* *לפיכך . . . לרומם* or in the Palestinian text *לפיכך . . . לעלה ולקלם . . .* *לנדר ולנצח*. RABBINOWICZ in his *Dikduke Soferim* mentions other old readings, but all are agreed in reading heaped up praises usually seven or eight in number.<sup>12</sup> This Mishna has practically the same tradition as our paragraph, since *להודות* cannot be turned into the Hithpaal without giving it the meaning of “confess”<sup>13</sup>, and *יתברך*, corresponding with *לברך*, is in the Kaddish transposed to the beginning, as being the connecting link of the whole paragraph.

From these and similar examples, it is clear that the Gaonic mystics, the *יוררי מרכבה* are not to be held as the authors of this paragraph. In the language of the mystics there is an unvarying tradition, and the two works with the most frequent echoes of the seven praises are the mystic *היכלות רבתי* containing many old elements and TBER. and Z. also containing many very early traditions,

<sup>10</sup> Page 27 note 5 doubled expressions in Daniel. This heaping of synonyms of praise is very common in apocryphal works e. g. The Song of the three Holy Children and in the early Church liturgy. CARL MICHEL *Gebet und Bild in früh-christlicher Zeit* Leipzig 1902 p. 3. Apostolic Constitutions VIII 35. Even the prayer book of the Falashas shows the same style—JOSEPH HALÉVY Paris 1876 p. 21.

<sup>11</sup> Daniel 4 34. In Daniel, the earliest extant work of the mystic school, expressions of all kinds heaped up 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 fold are a marked feature of the style e. g. 2 27 4 4 5 7 11 magicians; 3 1 3 27 6 8 satraps (compare Jer 51 57); 3 4 7 29 31 5 19 6 26 7 14 peoples; 3 5 7 10 15 musical instruments; 2 37 4 33 7 27 kingdom; 5 11 14 wisdom; 5 4 23 gold etc. 3 21 clothes; etc.

<sup>12</sup> Tosafoth to Pesahim ib. Amram.

<sup>13</sup> 2 Chr 30 22 is questionable; and if it does not mean confess, it has at least a semi-active meaning “to give thanks”, here unsuitable. In Rabbinical Hebrew the Hithpaal always means confess.

so that this heaping seems to be a special characteristic of the mystics as BLOCH has pointed out. The origin of Jewish mysticism is usually traced back to the Essenes and the literature of the cosmogony, angelology, esoteric speculation and mysticism in general took its rise among them. We are therefore justified in seeking *the origin of this paragraph among the mystics, most probably among those who followed and carried on the traditions of the old Essenes, the predecessors of the Gaonic יורדי מרכבה*. Many prominent Rabbis belonged more or less to this (Essenic) mystic school, such as R. Simeon b. Yoḥai and Joshua b. Levi, and there is nothing against seeking the origin of this paragraph somewhere between the second and fourth centuries of the common era.

The Hebrew form <sup>14</sup>על הכל reads יתגדל ויתקדש וישתבח ויתפאר, the order of the terms agreeing with that in the Roman ritual (Shibbole ha-Leḳet), the Yemen tradition and the Genizah fragment (GDK. 53). Out of two dozen instances taken from TBER. and שבה and ברכ, היכלות רבתי are coupled 18 times, גדל and קדש 11 times. Very many prayers both old and more modern contain echoes of these praises, often in a Midrashically expanded form.<sup>15</sup> In the prayer book examples<sup>16</sup> ישתבח ויתפאר ויתרומם is a traditional order.

In the early middle ages fanciful explanations were given to the numbers of the terms of praise whether reckoned as seven,<sup>17</sup> eight<sup>18</sup> or ten<sup>19</sup> (including יתקדש ויתגדל). In the Kaddish the praises are usually joined with Vav.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Page 18, Soferim 14 12 text as edit. MÜLLER.

<sup>15</sup> E. g. in the grace after meals הרחמן הוא יתברך בשמים ובארץ הרחמן הוא ישתבח ויתפאר בנו לנצח נצחים ויתגדל בנו לעד ולעולמי עולמים.

<sup>16</sup> תתברך צורנו, Amram I 2b, ברוך שאמר, Amram I 27b, Vitry 154, במקהלות, Amram I 27b etc.

<sup>17</sup> Amram, and most authorities follow him, connects them with the 7 heavens.

<sup>18</sup> Maḥzor Vitry, Orḥoth Ḥayyim, Kol Bo equivalent to the 7 heavens and the expanse above the Ḥayyoth. Differently Eleazar of Worms, the 8 words of Moses.

<sup>19</sup> The 10 words (מאמרות) by which the world was created (Aboth 5 1), Rashi, Shibbole ha-leḳet (Zedekiah b. Abraham). Differently his brother Benjamin: God's 10 garments of justice and vengeance.

<sup>20</sup> In the old Genizah fragment (GDK. 53) only the last two are connected with Vav. So too Yemen Ms. Or. 2227 (1540 CE.) p. 18 b. Or. 2418. Cod. GASTER 321.



It is impossible to regard the words as anything but Hebrew.<sup>21</sup> Almost all old authorities recognise their Hebrew character and many are at pains to account for the change from Aramaic.<sup>22</sup> Abudarham gives the reason quite correctly that these words cannot be forced to take on an Aramaic dress **כי השבחה לא היו יכולין לשנותו ללשון**—even though we find passages like **על דא יתברך וישתבחה שמיא**—תרגום דמריה כולא (Vitry p. 172). **יתעלה** and **יתנשא** are purely Hebrew forms; **יתהדר** can only mean “to return, go around” etc. in Aramaic, and **יתפאר** and **יתהלל** are not used in Aramaic at all. The Ithpaals are used, as often the Nithpaal, as the usual new-Hebrew passive. Probably under Aramaic influence the Hithpaal form, preserving the original *a* vowel that is very common in classical Hebrew,<sup>23</sup> is used as far as we can tell from early punctuated new-Hebrew texts almost to the exclusion of the Hithpaal, especially, as here, in cases of words in rapid connection. It is as unnecessary then to point with many editions **יתברך**, **יתפאר** etc. as it would be to point **ישתבחה**. Most of the old MSS. and editions point the words as pausal, although for what reason it is difficult to see, unless it be to ensure their deliberate recitation.

**יתברך**. Amr. Maim. and many MSS. treat it<sup>24</sup> as part of the response requiring an **אמן** after it. Vitry etc. read **יתברך**.

**ישתבחה** in Biblical Hebrew apparently late and borrowed from Aramaic.<sup>25</sup> The usual Targ. to **יתפאר** and **יתהלל** is **ישתבחה**. It is here used as the pass. of the Pael “to be lauded”, not as “to boast”.

**יתפאר** a favourite root in Ben Sirach (48 4 50 20 ...). It is nowhere used as Aramaic. BARTH *E. S.* 21.

**יתרום** Ithpalal, Hebrew, but in Aramaic not necessarily a Hebraism—Dan 4 34 (11 36).<sup>26</sup> BARTH *E. S.* 14. This word is almost

<sup>21</sup> BAER treats them as Aramaic, as did Solomon b. Adereth.

<sup>22</sup> Rashi Pardes, Maḥzor Vitry (p. 8) explain the change into Aramaic after them as an avoidance of the **שם** in Hebrew. So **ארחות חיים** and **כל בו** which also, as Rashi, give as a reason of their being in Hebrew that there is no occasion to conceal these praises from the angels. <sup>23</sup> Ges.-KAUTZSCH<sup>27</sup> § 54 k.

<sup>24</sup> Also Shulḥan Aruch Oraḥ Ḥayyim 56 2. Isserles ib. Tur Oraḥ Hayyim 56.

<sup>25</sup> So KAUTZSCH, *Aramäismen im Alten Testament* p. 87. On the Rabbinical use of **שבח** BACHER *ETA.* 212.

<sup>26</sup> NÖLDEKE, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1884 1016.



always pointed ויתרום in old MSS. e. g. Amram Or. 1067, and the editions.

וַיִּתְנַשֵּׂא perhaps coupled with ויתרום under the influence of Isa 33 10 אָנֹשׂ עֵתָּה אֲרוֹמָם עֵתָּה וַיִּנָּשֵׂא רָם Isa 6 1 57 15.

וַיִּתְהַדֵּר usually pointed ויתהדר.

וַיִּתְקַלֵּם So Amram, Seadya and SCHECHTER's Genizah fragment (GDK. 53). Later texts ויתהלל. Cf. Mishna Pes. 10 5 לקלם (p. 56). From a responsum of Abraham Maimonides<sup>27</sup> we learn that his father Moses preferred ויתהלל to ויתקלם. In Amram's time already the custom varied and he notes that while some say ויתקלם, others do not. The reason for the change from ויתקלם was because of its double meaning.<sup>28</sup> In Biblical Hebrew the verb קלם and its derivatives means only to mock, scorn, scoff, and קלם 'derision' is always parallel to חרפה. In Ben Sirach too (11 4) it bears the same meaning, but also (probably) in the Piel to sing praises ותקלם שירה [ב]מרום 47 15. In Rabbinical Hebrew the verb is commonly used in the sense of to jump, leap, spring<sup>29</sup> and very commonly in the sense of to praise, sing praises<sup>30</sup>, as in Aramaic;<sup>31</sup> and as long as Aramaic was the ruling language, this latter meaning would

<sup>27</sup> Beginning of the מעשה רוקח 51b. c.

<sup>28</sup> Ha-Manhig (Tefilla 28).

<sup>29</sup> See the *Wiener Zeitschrift f. Kunde d. Morgenlandes* XVII 1903 p. 165 ff. Prof. A. BÜCHLER.

<sup>30</sup> J. Shab. 16, 15c<sup>34</sup> Sof. 16 11 (p. 222) the 147 Psalms of the book of Psalms connected by GRAETZ (Psalmen p. 9) with the triennial circle of reading the Pentateuch, are called מְקַלְמֵי שִׁירָא לְהַקְבִּי'ה לקלם. Midr. Ps 89 1 p. 381 מִי לְבָרַךְ וְלִקְלֵם לְבוֹרְאוֹ שִׁירָא. Ber. Rab. 11, Yalkut II 835, 941. Sota 40a<sup>26</sup> יתקלם עילא. PR. El. 3 etc. etc. BACHER *ETA*. 190 f.

<sup>31</sup> BÜCHLER l. c. finds the root meaning of קלם in the signification "leap, jump". From the leaping at weddings or funerals that accompanied words of praise he derives the meaning "praise", and from stamping the foot, that of "scorn, deride" etc. He thus rejects the usual derivation of קלם praise from the Greek—PAYNE SMITH κλέος fame, LEVY TWB. κλεῖζω, FLEISCHER, *Nachtrag to Levy TWB*. 576, KOHUT, *Aruch*, FRÄNKEL, *Aram. Fremdwörter* 284, DALMAN, *Gram.* 183 καλῶς, καλός, KRAUSS, *Griech. u. Lat. Lehnwörter im Talmud* II 547 καλεῖσθαι, WELLHAUSEN (quoted by BEVAN) a denominative from καλῆσις. A. A. BEVAN agreeing with LEVY NHWB., compares the double meaning of הלל (GESENIUS, BROWN *Lexicon*) praise, and Syriac Afel ܠܠܐ mock, both from the root meaning to cry out. *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet* 1906, Vol. 1, p. 581 f.





במקלות: as is the parallel passage in כבודך ומרומם על כל ברכה ותהלה . . . לעלה ולקלם על כל דברי שירות ותשבחות דוד בן ישי. Moreover alone occurs very exceptionally (e. g. Deut 32:3 JII) even though קודשא is, in accordance with Aramaic idiom, usually used with ד as a Genitive instead of the adjective קדישא. In such cases too בריך הוא or some such response was almost certainly added in actual recitation. The sense of the passage is obviously יתברך ישתבח שמיא דקב"ה לעילא amplified by לעילא מכל ברכתא מכל תושבחתא.

לְעִילָא in the Hebrew versions למעלה. עִילָא<sup>37</sup> is better than עִילָא<sup>38</sup> or עִילָא<sup>39</sup> in pointed texts. לעילא לעילא of Rashi, the Roman or Yemen rites is better than the form often found לעילא ולעילא in spite of the Genizah fragment (GDK. 53) למעלה ולמעלה. Compare Deut 28:43 מעלה מעלה in the Targum לעילא לעילא. MS. Add. 27,086 reads לעיל, once לעילא with the א crossed out.

מְכַל or מְכָל or מן or the contracted form מִּי is quite as differently used in the old versions as in Biblical Aramaic where מְכַל and מְכָל occur together Dan 4:22, and מְכַל and מְכָל occur together in the one verse Ezra 6:14. On the whole however מן in Biblical Aramaic is more often unassimilated. According to DALMAN (*Gr.* 227) מן in the Palest. Talmud and Midrashim often remains unassimilated, so also in the Jerus. Targumim. In Onkelos, according to MS. Socin 74 מן is almost without exception assimilated, but never in קדם, מן קדם, and in Mandaic<sup>40</sup> the ן is not assimilated—at least orthographically not.

ברכתא—see on נחמתא p. 62.

שִׁירָתָא וְתִשְׁבְּחָתָא belong intimately together. Hence שִׁירָתָא, not שִׁירָתָא וְתִשְׁבְּחָתָא—שִׁירָתָא וְתִשְׁבְּחָתָא is a usual expression for Psalms.<sup>41</sup> שִׁירָתָא וְתִשְׁבְּחָתָא becomes in the Targum שִׁירָתָא וְתִשְׁבְּחָתָא, while

<sup>37</sup> Dan 6:3. Nabatean (LDZB. 341) Egyptian Aramaic SAYCE-COWLEY A. 5 10 11 13 etc. Several MSS. e. g. Add. 26,954.

<sup>38</sup> Most MSS. and almost all editions. Targum Sabionetta etc. DALMAN.

<sup>39</sup> Amram Ms. Or. 1067. Or. 2736, 2389. Add. 18,230.

<sup>40</sup> NÖLDEKE, *Mand. Gram.* § 158.

<sup>41</sup> Of David Ber 3b<sub>17</sub> 7b<sub>24</sub> Sanh 92b<sub>7</sub> Midr. Ps 22:1 p. 180. Of Solomon Targ. Cant 1:1 4:11 Midr. Ps 22:1 p. 130. Biblical תפלות e. g. Ps 72:20. Cf. Mechilta to Exod 15:1 p. 34a, Tanhuma ibid. HARKAVY, *Responsen der Geonim* 30 f.



שיר, שירה appears regularly as תושבתא, תושבתא<sup>42</sup> which are also the regular Targum equivalents for מומור, often for תהלה<sup>43</sup> and even for תורה<sup>44</sup> למננה<sup>45</sup> ננינת<sup>46</sup> etc. Both words are therefore used synonymously for every kind of song of praise.

Seadya reads תשבתא. See on פָּרָקָן p. 37. תשבתא of many editions is a vulgarism, perhaps, as Dr. GASTER suggests, here assimilated to the preceding vowel of ברכתא שירתא. The change of *u* to *ü* (*i*) occurred dialectically in old Arabic, and occurs occasionally, e. g. in Palestine, in vulgar dialects to day.<sup>47</sup> It may perhaps be compared with the form דכרונה Ezra 6 2 as contrasted with דכרניא Ezra 4 15 and the Tagum form דוכרנא. Compare also סומפניה (συμφωνία, symphonia) Dan 3 5 15 occurring beside סיפניה in the Kethibh (סופניה Q're) Dan 3 10 and the Neo Hebrew and Aramaic form סימפון (tube) [Palmyrene Tariff ספון, Syriac ܣܦܢܐ]. On תושבתא BARTH NB. § 190 d.

נְהַמָּתָא<sup>48</sup> בְּרִכָּתָא . . . וְנְהַמָּתָא<sup>49</sup> is better than נְהַמָּתָא<sup>50</sup> or נְהַמָּתָא<sup>51</sup>. The word here cannot mean consolations offered to God, although the medieval commentators interpreted it so with the aid of various Midrashim.<sup>52</sup> Nor have we any authority to correct the reading to נעמתא, נחמתא or to anything else.<sup>53</sup> With as little suc-

<sup>42</sup> JI Exod 15 1 Num 21 17 שירה equals שירתא.

<sup>43</sup> Ps 51 17 100 4 106 47 145 1 149 1. <sup>44</sup> Ps 42 5. Compare Jonah 2 10.

<sup>45</sup> Ps 11 1 54 1. <sup>46</sup> Ps 55 1 61 1 76 1

<sup>47</sup> WRIGHT, *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic languages*. Cambridge 1890 p. 77. DALMAN'S *Grammar* 171 and 87 and older literature there given.

<sup>48</sup> Amram Or. 1067, REUCHLIN, MERX, DALMAN, Yemen.

<sup>49</sup> BAER just as פָּעָמָא Dan 6 3 ed. BAER, etc.

<sup>50</sup> Many editions e. g. LANDSHUTH.

<sup>51</sup> JASTROW, many editions.

<sup>52</sup> Rashi in Shibbole ha-Leḳeṭ, Nissāḥon § 113 understand praises offered for consolations about to be given. Hai Gaon, Maḥzor Vitry, the Zohar to שופטים refer it to the comforts of the future when God's Name will be perfect. Rashi Pardes (ed. Amsterdam p. 7b), Orḥoth Hayyim, Ṭur Orah Hayyim 56 etc. refer to the comfort of the Midrash Ber 3 a (B. p. 8).

<sup>53</sup> Even המנתא, 'Hymns' (!) has been suggested by Z. F. Vidaver in Hamagid 33, 1889 p. 11. It is well known that the gutturals were locally smoothed out so as to be all of the character of the *ṣ*. Cf. FRANKEL, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* 1841 p. 101, 110. Mechilta to Exod 12 13 p. 8a ופסחתי is explained by ופסחתי. Sifre to Deut 32 24 p. 137b בהמות is interpreted by בחמות (BACHER ETT. 175). In Erub. 53b 11 the cry of a Galilean (למאן אמר) is understood as חמור, חמר, אימר or עמר.

cess PHIL. BLOCH<sup>54</sup> tries to prove it a strict synonym of **שירתא** **ברכתא** **היכלות רבתי** occurring otherwise in this meaning only in **תושבתתא** p. 101. There is there attributed to God in a list of over 80 attributes . . . **נחת מנוחה ונחמה שלוח השקט ושלום שאנן במח** . . . The word here, if it means anything at all—and the text of **היכלות רבתי** is notoriously very imperfectly preserved—must in connection with its neighbouring words obviously be a synonym for “rest, peace, quietness”. This it cannot mean; and it is either inserted as inappropriately as many other words in the list, for the anagrammatic play on **מנוחה**, or is more simply still a corruption of **מנוחה**.

**נחמתא**, in addition to its general meaning of comfort, consolation for mourning and sorrow, often means the comfort of the future Messianic life. Gen 49 1 JII **נחמתא ונחמתא** **קץ ברכתא** means this. In the Targum to Isa 18 4 God promises to bring **בירכן וניחמן** upon Israel. So too in Joel 2 14 Targ. the repentant sinner will receive **נחמן**. In a similar sense of the future promise **נחמן** often occur together.<sup>55</sup>

**נחמתא** in the sense of the Messianic comfort again often seems to be identified chronologically with the resurrection.<sup>56</sup> Hosea 6 2 **יחיננא ליומי** becomes in the Targum **נחמתא דעתידין למיתי ביום אחיות מיתא יקימננא**. Among the seven things hidden from man are **יום המיתה ויום הנחמה**.<sup>57</sup> But **נחמתא** is more often used generally of the comforts of the Messianic promise, just as the Messiah is called **מנחם** Sanh 98 b.<sup>58</sup> Jer 31 5, 2 Sam 23 4 **מחמדן לשני נחמתא דאתין**. The leviathan and his mate are being kept **ליום נחמתא** Gen 1 21 JI. 2 Sam 23 1 speaks of **עלמא ליומי** **נחמתא**. Taan 11a<sup>15</sup> **אל יראה בנחמת הצבור**, a formula of cursing, perhaps also belongs here.

The oath **נחמתא אראה** “may I not see the comfort if . . .” in the

<sup>54</sup> MGWJ. XXXVII 266.

<sup>55</sup> Gen 45 28 J I and II J. Sanh. 10, 28 b<sup>33</sup> Num 23 23 J II.

<sup>56</sup> But not as MERX, *Chrestomathia Targumica*, NESTLE, *Philologica Sacra* 5 Note 2 on philological grounds. Cf. Peshitta John 11 24.

<sup>57</sup> Pes. 54 b<sup>2</sup> Mechilta **בשלח** Exod 16 32 p. 51a. Gen Rab 65 to Gen 27 2 Yalkut 114.

<sup>58</sup> J. Ber 24 5a<sup>14</sup> notes that the **חושבנא**—the numerical value—of **מנחם** (138) is the same as that of **צמח**, also a name of the Messiah. See p. 37 note 61.



mouth of Simeon b. Shetah (fl. 90—76 B. C.)<sup>59</sup> or of his contemporary Jehuda b. Tabbari<sup>60</sup> would also seem to refer to the comfort of the future life. On the other hand when said by R. Eleazar b. Zadok (fl. 2nd cent. C. E.)<sup>61</sup> the consolation of Jerusalem is probably meant. This special consolation is often the meaning of נחמתא: Isa 33 20 יחויו בנחמת ירושלם, Isa 4 3 עיניך יחיו בנחמת ירושלם. Compare Isa 51 3, J. Ber. 5 8d<sup>22</sup> בנחמות ירושלם היו עוסקין.<sup>62</sup>

But נחמתא here can mean neither ordinary comforts for mourning, nor the consolation of Jerusalem; neither the comforts of the Messianic time, nor of the resurrection. It is used here in the *transferred meaning of "glorifying consolations", books, prophecies, sermons, praises, songs etc. containing and dealing with these future comforts.* The passages themselves are called נחמתא from their chief contents. Thus in Ber 48b<sup>20</sup> the passage רחם (נחם) in the grace after meals is called נחמה. In the arrangement of the canonical books, books dealing with calamity are put together and books with the note of consolation are made to follow one another: ישעיהו כוליה B. B. 14b<sup>10</sup>. Again נחמתא, the book of Isaiah is one long paean of consolation (Targ. to Isa 40 1). In 2 Macc 15 9 occurs "he comforted them out of the law and the prophets; (ver. 11) armed with *comfortable* and good words". Messianic prophecies, especially those of Isaiah<sup>63</sup> were called נחמתא and these, read as the הפטרה, became particularly identified with נחמתא.<sup>64</sup>

נחמתא, or rather נחמתא . . . ברכתא, therefore, here means the praises and Messianic consolations brought by the preacher in his Aggada. R. Levi and R. Isaac (4th cent.) complain of the neglect of the

<sup>59</sup> T. Sanh 8 3, 427 19 Sanh 37b 9 Shebu 34a 18 Macc 5b 16.

<sup>60</sup> Hag 16b 8 J. Sanh 6, 23b 3. <sup>61</sup> Keth 67a 5. Cf. Matt 5 35 b.

<sup>62</sup> See p. 84 note 33.

<sup>63</sup> כל הנחמות שאמר ישעיהו BB 14b<sup>10</sup>. Tanhuma to Deut. 1 ישעיהו כוליה נחמתא. כפלים הם. Cf. Isa 40 2.

<sup>64</sup> On the meaning of נחמתא SCHWALLY, *Idioticon d. christl. paläst. Aram.* 54f, MERX, *Chrestomathia Targumica*. DWJ. 71. RAPOPORT חמר III 45. 'Erech Millin art. אנרה p. 8 col. 2 followed by ZUNZ *GV*. 335 note f. 372 note f. DAVID OPPENHEIM in KOBAR's *Jeshurun* 4 p. 57—63. K. KOHLER Appendix to KOHUT's *Aruch* p. 59. GRAETZ *MGWJ*. 1872 486f. PLESSNER מן לבנון p. 71.



Halacha<sup>65</sup> i. e. ועכשיו . . . אין מבקשין לשמע אלא דברי ברכות ונחמות . . . Aggada in contrast with Halacha. ברכות is here used in the specialized sense of the praises of the Aggada as in<sup>66</sup> כותבי ברכות שורפי תורה . . . מעשה באחד שהיה כותב ברכות . . . אמר ר' יהושע בן לוי הרי אנדתא הכותבה . . . אנא מן יומאי לא אסתכלית גו ספר דאנדתא . . . All four expressions שירתא ותושבחתא and ברכתא . . . ונחמתא may thus originally have referred to the Aggada of the preacher. מצינו בנביאים הראשונים<sup>67</sup> שהיו חותמין את דבריהם בדברי שבה ודבריה נחמות and the sense of the whole paragraph is that God is praised and exalted far above all the praises and glorifying words that can be uttered in this world.

דאמירן בעלמא דאמירן in conscious contrast to בעלמא דאתי as Cant. 1 1 Targ. עסרתי שירתא איתאמרו בעלמא הדין. In the burial Kaddish as given by Rashi<sup>68</sup> it is expanded to דאמירן בעלמא הדין ודאיתאמרו בעלמא דאתי. The perf. דאיתאמרו or דאיתאמרו can give sense only by referring to the praises<sup>69</sup> and songs<sup>70</sup> of the angels, but it does not suit בעלמא דאתי. Perhaps either דיתאמרו 'that will be said', or at least דמתאמרו is the more correct reading. The Perf. 3rd pl. fem. sometimes ends in -ן in the Jer. Targ., sometimes, as in Onkelos in א- (DG. 255). The Ithpeel is better than the Ithpaal.

ואמרו אמן See above pp. 41f.

תתקבל צלותהון ובעיתיהון דכל- [בית] ישראל קדם אבוהון דבשמיא ואמרו אמן: So Amram I 13b, Vitry 64. Old Castilian, Abudarham, Old Roman, Genizah. With בית modern Spanish and Roman. Tripoli<sup>1</sup> reads צלותנא ובעיתנא. Carpentras<sup>2</sup> and Lille<sup>3</sup> as Tripoli adding

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Pesikta 12 p. 101b ed. BUBER, Cant. Rab. to 2 5 p. 15b. Soferim 16 4.

<sup>66</sup> J. Shab 16 1 15c <sup>34</sup> Shab 61b <sup>17</sup> 115b <sup>4</sup> Soferim 15 4 16 10 Temurah 14 b. Cf. Exod Rab 47 7.

<sup>67</sup> J. Ber 5 8d <sup>27</sup> Ber 31a <sup>28</sup> T. Ber. 3 21 8 10 and text notes. Pesikta 116a כל הנביאים פתחו בחובות וחתמו בדברי תוכחות וחתמו בדברי נחמות וסיימו בנחמות.

<sup>68</sup> Mahzor Vitry p. 247. <sup>69</sup> Ps 103 20 148 2 Gen 32 27 JI etc.

<sup>70</sup> Ps 19 2 Job 38 7 Megil 10b 7 Hag 14a <sup>10</sup> etc. Apostol. Constitut. II 56.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Mordecai b. Hillel of Nürnberg, d. 1298, to Taanith 635.

<sup>2</sup> Add. 19,667. The printed edition reads as the Spanish and Roman rites.

<sup>3</sup> MS. GASTER 164.

.. עם צלותהון ובעותהון רכל בית . . Corfu<sup>4</sup> so, omitting בית, with אבונא for אבוהון.

תתקבל צלותהון ותתעבד בעותהון וצלותהון ובעותהון דכל בית ישראל קדם  
 :אבוהון דבשמאי: Maimonides.<sup>5</sup> Yemen and Chinese read for the first  
 וצלותהון ובעותהון also בעותהון for בעותכון and so צלותכון, צלותהון  
 appears in Yemen texts עם צלותהון ובעותהון or עם בעותהון and אבונא  
 regularly for אבוהון. Cingalese-Cochin in the elaborate Kaddish reads  
 תתקבל צלותכון ותתעבד בעותכון: אמן: וצלותהון ובעותהון דעמא כל בית  
 ישראל קדם מאריה דבשמיא בכל זמן ובכל עירן ועידנא הדין לחיים טובים  
 תתקבל צלותנא ותתעבד בעותנא Persian Codex Adler 23 reads וצלותהון  
 דעם צלותהון ובעותהון רכל בית ישראל לקדם מן דבשמיא וארעא ואמרו אמן

According to Maimonides this verse was added by the people; hence the absence of ואמרו אמן in his version.

It is a closing formula for the end of a service and was perhaps the old dismissal formula of the synagogue in use before the Kaddish was introduced into the synagogue. The terminology of it is so natural and traditional, that, excepting the response 'יה שמ' . . רב', it is probably the oldest verse of the Kaddish. The 16th blessing of the Shemone 'Esre is fully parallel to תתקבל in that it comprehends all the preceding paragraphs in one prayer that they may be heard . . תפלתנו . . שומע תפלות ותחנונים. The short Tefilla (Shemone 'Esre) is given by R. Jose (139—165) as שמע תפלתם עמך ישראל ועשה מהרה בקשתם, R. Joshua und R. Eleazar b. Zadok his contemporaries substituting respectively שועת or צעקת for תפלת,<sup>6</sup> all three versions being very similar to this paragraph. The Samaritan liturgy too offers a close parallel<sup>7</sup> in מן יקבל צלותכון מי אנה as indeed almost any liturgy could show parallels

<sup>4</sup> MS. GASTER 155.

<sup>5</sup> Maimonides MS. GASTER 173 reads as Amram.

<sup>6</sup> Ber 29b<sup>12</sup> DS T. Ber 37 616. In the Tanḥuma to ואתחנן beginning (ed. BUBER 3), תפלה, שועה, and צעקה are among the ten expressions of תפלה. In Sifre to Deut 3 23 (p. 70b) צעקה is not reckoned, but וצקה occurs as in the Tanḥuma list. All three words could possibly be turned into Aramaic as צלותא. Cf. Deut Rab. 2 beginning.

<sup>7</sup> Cod. Brit. Mus. Add. 19,017 p. 55b quoted in S. RAPPOPORT, *La Liturgie Samaritaine* 1900.

with this closing formula<sup>8</sup> that seems to be directly descended from Biblical usage. It has been poetically amplified in the piece תענו ותעתרו ברחמים מן השמים תקבל צעקתכם תשמע ברצון תפלתכם . . . that includes a long alphabetical supplication.<sup>9</sup>

This addition to the original Kaddish of praise, and the following ones are in perfect accord with the rule that praise should precede prayer<sup>10</sup> לעולם יסדר אדם שבחו של הקדוש ב"ה ואחר כך יתפלל; and in this respect the Kaddish just as the Paternoster is divisible into one half of praise and one half a prayer for needs.

תתקבל, editions often Hebraized תתקבל, as distinct from שמע to hear, listen with the ears, means to hearken to, accept, receive, hear.<sup>11</sup> Gen 16 2 Onk.

נְלוֹתָהוּ, צלו, צלותא with Holem. צלותא of many MSS. and editions is a Syriasm. Compare in Arabic the loan word صَلَوَةٌ. It is the usual equivalent of תפלה and expressions like שמע קול<sup>12</sup>, ענה<sup>13</sup>, שמע קול<sup>14</sup> are translated in the Targum by קבל צלותא. The word must not be taken here in the technical sense of Shemone 'Esre<sup>15</sup> as referring to this prayer recited earlier in the service. On the form see LAGARDE *Übersicht* 150, DALM. *Gr.* 148.

וּבְעִיתָהוּ a Kāṭul form like וְכוּ, גְלוּ BARTH NB. 152 § 99 b. Cf. חֲכָמִי. Dan 6 8 14. Expressions like שְׁעָה<sup>16</sup>, שְׁעָה<sup>17</sup>, תַּחֲנָה<sup>18</sup> are reproduced in the Targum by בעותא often with the verb עבר<sup>19</sup> or קבל<sup>20</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Compare the prayer used by Augustinus at the close of a sermon. FERD. PROBST, *Katechese und Predigt* p. 161f.

<sup>9</sup> Spanish Minhag for the 10 days between New Year and the Day of Atonement (1—10 Tishri) founded upon Amram II 21b.

<sup>10</sup> Ber 32a 4 AZ. 7b 10 R. Samlai (cf. Ezra 2 46 Kethibh). Sifre 343 p. 142 a to Deut. 33 2 Ber 31a 8 Deut Rab. 2 to Deut 3 23.

<sup>11</sup> On קבל see KAUTZSCH, *Aramäismen im Alten Testament* 76.

<sup>12</sup> Isa 65 24 Jon 2 3 Ps 120 1.

<sup>13</sup> Deut 26 7 Ps 18 7 = 2 Sam 22 7 2 Chr 30 27. אל שמע Deut 9 19.

<sup>14</sup> 1 Kgs 8 45 49 = 2 Chr 6 35 39 Ps 65 3.

<sup>15</sup> Ber 17a 14 18 Pes 117b 16 18 22.

<sup>16</sup> 1 Sam 1 17 27.

<sup>17</sup> 2 Sam 22 7 = Ps 18 7 Ps 39 13 40 2 145 19 Lam 3 56.

<sup>18</sup> 1 Kings 8 30 38 54 = 2 Chr 6 29 35 39 Ps 6 10.

<sup>19</sup> Jon 2 3 Ps 18 7 = 2 Sam 22 7 Isa 65 24.

<sup>20</sup> 1 Kings 8 28 30 2 Chr 6 19 33 13. אָהָה, when not equivalent to 'alas!', is invariably (10 times) קביל בעוית ה' (Jud 6 22 ed. PRÄTORIUS בבועו) as is also אָהָה 2 Kgs 20 3 = Isa 38 3 Jon 1 14 4 2.



and the words **צלותא** and **בעותא** are used practically synonymously,<sup>21</sup> either paired together with the one verb **קבל**<sup>22</sup> or with the two **קבל** and **עבר**.<sup>23</sup> Abudarham quotes the Jerusalem Targum to **בחרבי ובקשתי** (Gen 48 22) as **בצלתי ובבעותי** probably suggested by **(ובקשתי)**, a reading not found in our editions.<sup>24</sup>

**צלותא** as the superlinear texts, Onkelos (not Sabionetta) and the analogy of the Syriac show. The editions (BAER, GINSBURG) of Daniel and Ezra give **נָא**.

On the redundant **בעותהון דכל** see above p. 41.

**קָרַם**, occurring 42 times in Biblical Aramaic and frequently in inscriptions<sup>25</sup> is best written with **Ḥaṭef-Kameṣ**. Compare Mandaic **קוראם**, Syriac **ܩܪܡܐ**, superlinear **קָרַם**. According to the Masora to Onkelos Exod 6 5 3 9, the school of Sura there reads **קָרַמִּי**, that of Nehardea **קָרַמִּי**.<sup>26</sup>

**אָבוהוֹן דְּבִשְׁמִיא** On the occurrence of the **ו** before suffixes BARTH *ZDMG.* XLI 1887 609 ff. **אָבוהוֹן** and **אָבוּנָא** are both accented on the penultimate syllable. In Onkelos and the Targum to the Prophets the suffix of the 1st pers. plur. is regularly **נָא**—, in the Jer. Targum it varies between **נָא**— and **וֹ**—. <sup>27</sup> The Maḥzor Vitry reads **אָבוהוֹן דִּישְׁמִיא** perhaps a slip. But **אָבוהוֹן דִּישְׁמִיא** occurs in Exod 15 12 JII perhaps also a lapsus calami, and another variant **אָבוּכּוֹן** occurs Gen 21 33 JII. The simple **אָבוּנָא**, **אָבוּכּוֹן**

<sup>21</sup> **רנה** in Jer 7 16 11 14 Ps 42 5 61 2 88 3 is turned by **בעותא**; but in Jer 14 12 1 Kgs 8 28 = 2 Chr 6 19 Ps 106 44 119 169 142 7 it appears as **צלותא**. **שועה**, usually = **בעותא**, is in Ps 34 16 = **צלותא**. **שמע קול** translated by the Targum as **קבל צלותא** (note 13), in Jon 2 3 is turned by **בעותא**. **עבר תחנה** mostly translated by **בעותא** (note 18) is in Ps 55 2 (**צלות**).

<sup>22</sup> 1 Kgs 8 28 45 49 = 2 Chr 6 19 35 39.

<sup>23</sup> Ps 18 7 = 2 Sam 22 7 Isa 65 24.

<sup>24</sup> GINSBURGER J I and J II and BERLINER's (Sabionetta) Onkelos have not this reading. It occurs however in some editions of Onkelos. Cf. BB 123a 12.

<sup>25</sup> LDZB. 360.

<sup>26</sup> Berliner Onkelos II 143f. MERX, *Abhandlungen des fünften Orientalisten-Congresses* I p. 166. D. Gr. 46. 75. 156. 230.

<sup>27</sup> **אָבוּנָא** regularly in J II Gen 18 1 21 33 28 10 49 2 18 21. But 49 18 in Cod. Oxford 2305 **אָבוּנָא**. Onkelos on the other hand regularly has **אָבוּנָא** Gen 19 31 f. 31 1 14 16 42 13 43 28 Num 27 3. So too J I in these passages, whereas in Exod 36 33 Lev 22 28 Deut 6 4 31 14 J I reads **אָבוּנָא**.



יְהִי שְׁלָמָא רַבָּא מִן־שָׁמַיָא וְסִיעָתָא וּפְרָקָנָא עֲלֵיכוֹן וְעֲלֵנָא וְעַל־כָּל־קְהָלָהוֹן דִּישְׁרָאֵל  
 יְהוּ—Maimonides, Yemen MSS. begin similarly, with יהוי for  
 יה, up to פורקנא. Each MS then goes its own way, such as ורְחֵמָא  
 וְחַסְדָא וְרַחֲמֵי עֲלֵיכוֹן וְעֲלֵנָא וְעַל כָּל קְהָלָהוֹן דְּכָל בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל לְחַיִּים וּלְשָׁלוֹם  
 וְרוּחָא וְחַיִּים וְשָׁבַע וְיִשׁוּעָה וְנַחֲמָה וְשִׁיבָא וְרַפּוּאָה וְנֹאזְלָה וְרוּחַ . .  
 וְרוּחָא וְחַיִּים וְשָׁבַע וְיִשׁוּעָה וְנַחֲמָה וְפִרְנָסָה וְכֻלְכָּלָה ; והצלה עליכון ועלנא . .  
 . . . עליכון etc. The Cingalese-Cochin rite (p. 23a) runs  
 similarly to Maimonides up to פורקנא, then ends כל עליכון ועל כל  
 קהלהון דישראל לחיים ולשלום ולרפואה ואמרו אמן  
 . . . שמיא דבשמיא וסיעתא ופורקנא לחיים טובים עלינו ועל . . .

יְהִי שְׁלָמָא רַבָּא. This closing paragraph seems to have grown  
 up out of an original greeting of peace.<sup>4</sup> Its composite Hebrew  
 and Aramaic character—the Aramaic of Maimonides' reading is  
 hardly original, else it would be difficult to account for the mixed  
 character of all the other versions—would also indicate this. To  
 greet is expressed by שאל שלום, יהב שלום, greetings (שאילת שלום)  
 of all kinds were expressed by שלמא (שלום);<sup>5</sup> and examples of dis-  
 missal addresses frequently occur with שלמא (שלום): Taan 9b<sup>2</sup> כי הוּ  
 (editions) מיפמרי מיניה אמר להו וילו רבנן לשלם (לילו רבנן בשלמא  
 'On parting from him he would say to them "Go, masters, in peace"'.  
 M. K. 21b<sup>19</sup> R. Akiba dismisses his hearers after an address with  
 the words לכו לבתיכם לשלום. B. M. 14a<sub>13</sub> זיל לשלמא, the general rule  
 running Ber 64a<sub>16</sub>.<sup>6</sup> In the early Christian Church the preacher prefaced his address  
 with the greeting of peace and the peace greeting was given very

<sup>4</sup> So, in part, LANDSHUTH בקור חולים p. LXI. RAPPOPORT כרם III 46 sees  
 in it a parallel to the congregational יקום פורקן. But there seems to be nothing  
 to favor this.

<sup>5</sup> Taan 24b<sub>21</sub> . . . שלם טב . . . The greeting to non Jews בשלום ישראל שלום עליכם  
 J. Shebi 4 3 35b<sup>30</sup> Git 62a<sub>18</sub> Ber 55b Gen 43 27 1 Sam 25 5 f 2 Kgs 4 26. In  
 letters Ezr 4 17 5 7 Dan 3 31 6 26 Luke 24 36. SAYCE-COWLEY Egyptian Aram. N 1.  
 Gen. Rab. § 100 p. 187c מקומנו בשלום עליכם was current everywhere. On greetings generally ZUNZ,  
*Zur Geschichte* 304 et seq. D. Gr. 244 155 Aboth 4 15 Ber 17a<sub>15</sub> 3a<sub>15</sub> J. Ber  
 21 4b<sub>24</sub> J. Shek 2 6 47a<sub>15</sub> LDZB. 376.

<sup>6</sup> Exod. 4 18 Jud 18 6 1 Sam 1 17 20 42 25 35 29 7 2 Kgs 5 19 2 Sam 15 9  
 Mark 5 34 Luke 7 50 Acts 15 33. For more elaborate greetings at parting from  
 the study house Ber 17a<sub>6</sub> (Life etc.) Yoma 71a<sub>10</sub> (Life etc.) Ber 64a<sub>16</sub> (Peace).



frequently during every service, but especially at the end.<sup>7</sup> Particularly instructive are the dismissal words addressed by the priests to the people at the festival of the water drawing (T. Suc. 4 9 199 2) כשהיו נפטרין זה מזה מה היו אומרין זה לזה? יברכך ה' מציון וראה במוב (Ps 128 5 6) ירושלם כל ימי חיך וראה בנים לבניך שלום על ישראל. In the Masoretic text of the book of Psalms the dismissal greeting is added to the Psalm and has become an integral part of it. So too in Ps 125 the words שלום על ישראל have been added to the Psalm and somewhat similarly in the last verse of Psalm 134. This gives analogy enough for the phenomenon of this final (mutual?) greeting, in form a prayer like all such greetings, becoming an integral part of the whole prayer here in the Kaddish.

Another strong tendency working towards this is the desire everywhere visible to close prayers, lessons, homiletic addresses and Halachic studies with words of שלום (שלום). The massed up praise of peace beginning אמר ר' אלעזר אמר ר' חנינא is used for closing many of the chapters of the Talmud.<sup>8</sup> This tendency finds expression in such sayings as גדול שלום שכל הברכות וטובות ונחמות<sup>9</sup> שהקב"ה מביאן על ישראל תותמין בשלום, בקריאת שמע פורש סוכת שלום, בתפלה עושה שלום בברכת כהנים וישם לך שלום. "Great is peace, for all the blessings' promises of wellbeing and consolations that the Holy One, blessed be He, will bring upon Israel close with peace. In the blessing of the Shema' it runs 'who spreads His pavilion of peace'; in the eighteen benedictions 'who maketh peace'; the priestly blessing closes with and 'give thee peace'." It is possible that there is the double meaning of שלום (a) 'peace', (b) 'completion' to be traced at the bottom of this tendency. The words here may possibly also have served as a sign for the members of the family of Aaron to give the priestly blessing that closed the service (וישם לך שלום).<sup>10</sup>

רַבָּא The addition of רבא is probably occasioned in this case of

<sup>7</sup> Probst, *Liturgie des vierten Jahrhunderts* 162, 206, 443 etc. Didascalia II 55.

<sup>8</sup> Ber 64 a Nazir 66 b Yebam 122 b Kerith 28 b Tamid III 32 b Megillath Ta'anith. Isa 54 13 Ps 122 7—9 128 6 119 165 29 11. The whole Mishna closes with שלום 'Ukzin 3 12.

<sup>9</sup> Lev Rab 9 p. 14 a. For the highest appreciations of peace see the פרק השלום Lev Rab 9 p. 13 c Num Rab to Num 6 26 Sifre p. 13 a ib. Tanḥuma ib.

<sup>10</sup> J Taan 67 b B. Meg 18 a.

the Kaddish closing the exposition of the Law by the phrase שלום רב לאהבי תורתך (Ps 119 165) and the very familiar Midrash of R. Hanina's <sup>11</sup> שלום בעולם that was so often quoted at the end of the study. Otherwise the phrase שלמא רבא in a greeting does not seem to occur except in the guise of ישנא in the formula heading a proclamation.<sup>12</sup>

מִן־שְׁמַיָּא probably equal to 'from God'. שמיא (שמים) in later usage is one of the most frequently used designations for God. Already in Daniel the metonymy is visible from a comparison of two phases of the change like עיני לשמיא נמלת (4 31) and תנדע די שלמן שמיא (4 23). שמים (שמיא) is used for God almost entirely in combinations such as שם שמים, ש' בדי ש', מלכות ש', ירא שמים, שם שמים, an exception being formed by the commonly occurring מן שמיא (מן השמים). The fact that מן השמים always has the article as compared with the invariable use of שמים without the article otherwise in this connection, implies that in this combination with מן the local sense was never really obscured. Therefore in phrases such as אשה שהקנו לו מן השמים Ned 10 6, מרחמין עליו מן השמים Sanh 2 1, מרחמין עליו מן השמים (T. Shebu. 3 1 449 12), מרחמין עליו מן השמים (Shab. 151 b 8) and מרחמי עליה מן שמיא Yoma 69 b <sup>25</sup>, ואכריזו עליה מן שמיא Deut 24 3 J I, תיתי עלך אוכחותא מן שמיא Eccl 7 9 Targ. (cf. 2 Macc 9 4), יקום פורקן מן שמיא <sup>13</sup> as well as in יהא שלמא רבא מן שמיא here, the local sense is best brought out by translating "from Heaven" (with H).<sup>14</sup> It is therefore possible to see here a reference to the peace subsisting in heaven referred to very often in the Midrash as furthered by the study and practice of the law. A connection with some well known Midrash such as <sup>15</sup> אמר ר' אלכסנדר כל העוסק בתורה

<sup>11</sup> Compare Sanh 98 a <sup>16</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> Dan 3 31 6 26 R. Gamliel's letter T. Sanh 2 6 416 29 31 33 Sanh 11 b 7 J. Sanh. 1 18 d <sup>15</sup> 17 20.

<sup>13</sup> Page 90. Compare I Macc 12 15 16 3 help from Heaven. 3 19 strength from Heaven. Matth 21 25 Mark 11 30 Luke 20 4 John 3 27.

<sup>14</sup> On the name of God שמיא, שמים SCHÜRER, *Jahrbuch für protestant. Theologie* II 1876 p. 171. E. LANDAU, *Die dem Raume entnommenen Synonyma für Gott* (1888 Zürich) 14—28. DWJ. 178.

<sup>15</sup> Sanh. 99 b <sup>20</sup> Num Rab 13 p. 54 d. See further p. 77.

לשמה משים שלום בפמליא של מעלה ובפמליא של מטה שנאמר (Isa 27 5) או "All who busy themselves with the Torah for its own sake make peace in the heavens above and on the earth beneath" (with reference to Isa 27 5), would also help to explain very aptly the general tendency towards closing the study of the law with words of peace.

On the plural form שמים, שמיא BARTH, *ZDMG.* XLII, 1888, p. 341f. *D. G.* 201.

יְחִי! This paragraph shows the tendency towards expanding prayers in full play. Amram's version contains 11 words and of those the Hebrew 6 are probably a later addition. We have the ancient prayer אַבִּינוּ מַלְכֵנוּ in forms ranging from two verses to a litany of 53.<sup>16</sup> Extreme multiplication has not infrequently been condemned. In the *Tur* a protest is recorded against adding to the *versicles* at the end of the grace after meals.<sup>17</sup> The closing blessing of the Shemone 'Esre (no. 19), in character like the paragraph יהא שלמא, was originally limited to a prayer for peace. It contains in the modern Roman and German versions 5, in the Spanish, 7 words—(שים שלום) מובה וברכה חיים תן וחסד צדקה ורחמים—added to the original prayer for שלום as seen in the old Palestinian version.

The word חיים is sometimes treated in this paragraph as a congregational response, perhaps due to the tendency towards responding at every mention of God. As a response it is meaningless; but in exclamation as a wish or greeting it often occurs. 1 Sam 25 6 ותימרין כדן לחיך is turned by the Targum into וואמרתם כה לחי. On drinking wine . . . חמרא לחי (T. Shab 7 8 118 14) or חמרא וחי . . . (Shab 67 b VI end) was ejaculated. In parting greetings

<sup>16</sup> Two verses spoken by R. Akiba Ta'an 25 b 21, expanded to 3 Alfasi *ibid.*, and 5 in Jacob ibn Habib's 'Ain Ya'qob. In the liturgy they first appear as 19 verses, Amram (p. 45) 22 (25), the Old Spanish rite 23 or 27, Algiers and Constantine 28, Catalonia, Modern Spain (GASTER 37 ff) 29, Roman (p. 19 b) 30, Avignon and Greece 34. Worms 35—38, French 38, 40 or 41, Polish 42, German etc. (BAER p. 109 ff) 44, Salonica 53, ZUNZ, *Ritus* 118 ff.

<sup>17</sup> *Tur* Oraḥ Ḥayyim 189 (c. 1300 CE.). In Maimonides they number 3, modern German 9, mod. Spanish (p. 61) 18, Roman (p. 101 a) 22 etc.

<sup>18</sup> Compare 1 Kings 1 25 34 39 Ezek 16 6.



it seems to have been especially frequent—**מהדרי רבנן מפטרי** כי בפומבדיתא אמרי הכי מחייה חיים יתן לך חיים ארוכין וטובין ומתוקנן (Yoma 71a<sub>10</sub>): “The teachers in Pumbaditha when parting from one another used to say: ‘May He who creates life give thee a long life of happiness and strength’”; or **ר' אמר לה מבי ר'** חנינא אמרי ליה הכי עולמן תראה בחיך ואחריתך לחיי העולם הבא ותקותך . . . (Ber 17a<sub>6</sub>): “On parting from R. Ammi, according to others from R. Hanina, they would say to him ‘Mayst thou long enjoy the life of this world; may thy latter end be for the world to come and thy hope for all eternity’.” To the respectful interrogatory **סברי מרנן** the answer given was **לחיי** (חיים). On the form חיים see BARTH, *ZDMG.* XLII 1888 p. 344.

**ויסיעתא**. The form **ויסיעתא** may at bottom be a confusion of Vav and Yod as in **וימליך** and **וימלוך**. The Yemen texts vary between **סייעתא** and **סיעתא**.

**שבע** Judged by Biblical usage **שבע**<sup>19</sup> would be better than the more usual **שבוע**,<sup>20</sup> which, except in Ps 16 11, is always used adverbially joined with **ל**.

**ישועה ונחמה** are very often coupled in liturgical Hebrew.

**שינבא** an Aramaic (in the last instance Assyrian) word, the Targum equivalent of **פליטה**, **מקלט** etc., affords a further instance of the manner in which common words in Hebrew and Aramaic were used indifferently in either language. In form it is an Infinitive; hence **שינבא**.<sup>21</sup>

**ירפואה** The use of the sing.—which is not Biblical—in the sense of bodily healing—**רפאות** in the Bible is always used figuratively—is quite general in later Hebrew.

**גאולה** Biblically only of technical monetary redemption as **גְּאֻלָּה** BARTH, *E. S.* 18; in new Hebrew used almost entirely of redemption in a general sense.

**ויסליחה וכפירה** may perhaps have come into the prayer from the service of the ten penitential days (1—10 Tishri), just as many complete prayers, confessions and hymns have passed over from it

<sup>19</sup> BARTH *NB.* § 70a p. 105 LAGARDE *Uebersicht* 143 14.

<sup>20</sup> BARTH *ib.* § 24b p. 37.

<sup>21</sup> JASTROW **שינבא**.

into more general use.<sup>22</sup> Their absence from the Yemen texts lends color to this supposition. In Biblical Hebrew סליחה is used almost entirely in the Plural, only Ps 130 4 עמך הסליחה having the sing., and the abstract of כפר in use is כפּוּרִים. Postbiblical Hebrew prefers סליחה and כפרה, here also demanded for the assonance of the passage. סליחה 'forgiveness' in later technical use denotes a supplication for forgiveness, and as such has given its name to a large class of liturgical compositions. On כפרה see LAGARDE, *Übersicht* 230 et seq.

רוח וְהַצִּלָּה Esther 4 14. On רוּחַ BARTH *N. B.* § 80c p. 125. הצלה he regards (ib. § 60a p. 90) as an old infin. in *ā*.

עֲלֵנָא better than עֲלֵנָא of the editions (Sabionetta Targum etc.). Biblical Aramaic עֲלֵנָא BAER, עֲלֵנָא GINSBURG.

קְהָלָהוּן דִּישְׂרָאֵל On the redundant suffix p. 41. The use of קהל is apparently a Hebraism of the Targumist. עדה or כנסת ( συναγωγή ) is in the Targum כנישתא, while קהל ( ἐκκλησία ) is sometimes קהל, but more often כנישתא, כנישתא. The more truly Aramaic expression is כנישתא דִּישְׂרָאֵל, although קהלא קדישא (Ber 9b<sub>20</sub>) and כנישתא קדישתא (Sanh. 109b<sub>2</sub>) occur very similarly. According to SCHÜRER,<sup>23</sup> συναγωγή (עדה, כנסת) is the assembled body, the actual congregation, ἐκκλησία (קהל) the congregation as standing before God.(?) On קהל in Onkelos, see the Masora to Onkelos Num 14 5. According to LAGARDE<sup>24</sup> קהל means originally "court of justice" (*Rüegericht*).

עֲשֵׂה שְׁלוֹם בְּמִרוֹמָיו הוּא [בְּרִמְיָו] יַעֲשֵׂה שְׁלוֹם [עֲלֵינוּ] עַל-כֵּן יִשְׂרָאֵל [אֲמָרוּ אָמֵן]. The simplest form: Amram, Seadya and Or. 1479. With [ ]: Mahzor Vitry, German, mod. Spanish, mod. Roman, Cochín, the printed Carpentras text etc.

Maimonides,<sup>1</sup> Carpentras MSS., Lille, Genizah fragments, Spanish

<sup>22</sup> E. g. עֲלֵינוּ (GAST. 57 BAER 131 Rom. 25b DWJ. 307 Jewish Encyclopaedia I 336 f.), המבריל (GAST. 143 BAER 312) . . . וּכְרָנוּ בּוֹכְרֵן טוֹב (GAST. 4. 5) etc.

<sup>23</sup> SCHÜRER, *GJV.* II 504 f.

<sup>24</sup> LAGARDE *Uebersicht* 51 10.

<sup>1</sup> In the Shemone 'Esre. Spanish Shemone 'Esre.

ed. princ., old Italian<sup>2</sup> read as Vitry omitting ואמרו. Corfu and Romania add to Vitry's version הרבים after ברחמיו, Romania also adding Ps 29 11.

The Yemen texts vary. Some e. g. GASTER 321 as Vitry omitting ואמרו אמן, Or. 2418 omitting also עלינו. Others<sup>3</sup> run as follows עושה שלום במרומיו והוא ברחמיו וחסדיו יעשה שלום עלינו ועל כל בית ישראל אחינו וינחמינו בציון ויבנה ברחמיו את ירושלם בחיינו ובימינו בקרוב אמן ואמן. Persian Codex Adler 23 reads עושה שלום במרומיו הוא ברחמיו הרבים ובחסדיו הגדולים יעשה שלום על כל זרע ישראל וברוך (?) מנחם ציון עמו הוא בונה ברחמיו את עיר ירושלם ואמרו אמן.

A Genizah fragment<sup>4</sup> reads עושה שלום במרומיו יעשה שלום עלינו ועליכם ועל כל עמו ישראל ואמרו אמן.

This Hebrew verse, in substance superfluous after the preceding verse . . יהא שלמא, must have been added when the character of the latter as a prayer for peace was obscured by the addition of other words to שלמא, in accordance with the desire to close with שלום. It is similarly added to the Shemone 'Esre at the end<sup>5</sup> of the private prayer אלהי נצור<sup>6</sup> appended to the last blessing, obscuring the character of the closing peace blessing in exactly the same way. It is added also at the end of the German and Roman versions of the grace after meals. In no case however is it an original element of the prayer; but of these three places of its occurrence the Shemone 'Esre knew it first, and thence it was carried over to the Kaddish with the insertion of ואמרו. Three steps backwards with accompanying inclinations to the left, right and forward, formed the respectful mode of retiring from a superior, as a pupil from his teacher, or as the priests and Levites retired from the service in the Temple.<sup>7</sup> This form thus became identified with the parting peace greeting,<sup>8</sup> and was appropriately transferred to this verse, the concluding phrase of the Shemone 'Esre said while retiring from

<sup>2</sup> Or. 2736, ברחמיו is added later. Add. 27,072.

<sup>3</sup> Or. 1480 2389. GASTER 4, 249, a codex of 1760 etc. each with slight and immaterial variations. <sup>4</sup> GDK. 53.

<sup>5</sup> In the Roman rite (p. 18 a) at the beginning of אלהי נצור.

<sup>6</sup> Ber. 17a <sup>18</sup> the private supplication of Mar the son of Rabina, there given without this verse.

<sup>7</sup> Yoma 53a 7.

<sup>8</sup> Yoma 53b <sup>3</sup>. Cf. 53a 7, Shoher Tob to Ps 35 10.



the presence of God. These three steps backwards were then taken over into the Kaddish, together with the verse to which they had become attached.<sup>9</sup> In accordance with this custom, some MSS.<sup>10</sup> read at the close of the Shemone 'Esre instead of this verse שלום בשמאלי ושלום בימיני ושלום על כל ישראל תשים.<sup>11</sup> Others again e.g. Add. 26.954 שלום עלינו תשים or in the Romanian rite (Harl. 5583) שלום על ימיני שלום על שמאלי שלום על ישראל ועל ירושלם עיר הקדש.<sup>12</sup> The Spanish ritual ed. princ. reads עושה שלום but concludes עלינו וכן יהי רצון אמן.<sup>13</sup>

It is always assumed that . . . עושה שלום is late. The following consideration will show that, though late in the Kaddish, it has yet as a concluding verse an old tradition behind it. It is based on the half verse Job 25 2b עושה שלום במרומיו. This was interpreted as referring to peace between the angels. In later scholastic times<sup>14</sup> it was applied to the peace prevailing between the angels, some of whom are of the nature of fire, others of water. In the Yemenite Targum to the Shemone 'Esre, discovered by Dr. GASTER<sup>15</sup>, our verse is paraphrased דעביד שלמא בפמליא דילך בן מיכאל ונבריא ואת ברחמתך עביד שלמא עלנא ועל כל עמך ישראל. This idea is that already contained in the concluding prayer added to the Shemone 'Esre by R. Safra<sup>16</sup> בפמליא של מעלה ובפמליא של מטה. It is clear that the verse עושה שלום is simply the same idea in more Biblical language, taking the place of R. Safra's prayer at the end of the Shemone 'Esre. The traditional explanation of the verse in this connection is therefore the original one. The same idea is also at the bottom of the Midrash quoted above (p. 72f.) משים שלום בפמליא של מעלה ובפמליא של מטה. The comparison of above and below is a common one in Jewish thought and prayer.

<sup>9</sup> For some of the fancies that have grown up around these three steps see Vitry 18. 67. Ha-Manhig § 91. Shibbole ha-Lekeṭ 18. Maṭṭeh Moshe 153-160. ABR. LEVYSON <sup>10</sup> מקורי מנהגים p. 33. <sup>11</sup> Baer p. 105. <sup>12</sup> Yoma 53b <sup>13</sup> 10.

<sup>14</sup> Compare 1 Sam. 25 6 1 Chr 12 18. Prof. BEZOLD draws my attention to the Assyrian šulmu, šulmu, šulmu. CARL BEZOLD, *Die babyl.-assy. Keilinschr. in ihrer Bedeutung für das A. T.* (Tübingen '04), p. 59. J. HAHN, *Siebenzahl und Sabbat* (Leipzig '07) p. 65.

<sup>15</sup> More reasonably than reading ואמרי in a private prayer said in an undertone. <sup>16</sup> Orhoth Ḥayyim, Kol Bo etc.

<sup>17</sup> MGWJ. XXXIX 1894 p. 90.

<sup>18</sup> Ber 16b 1.

R. Eleazar prayed<sup>17</sup> עשה רצונך בשמים ממעל ותן נחת רוח ליראיך מלמטה. One introduction to the Kedusha<sup>18</sup> runs נקדש את שמך בעולם כשם שמקדישים אותו בשמי מרום.

Some similarity has been pointed out between this verse and the greater doxology of the Church, the Gloria in Excelsis Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ καὶ πατρί ἡ εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοχίας (Luke 2 14), but it cannot be pressed, even though ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοχίας be taken as the equivalent of פמליא של ממה, in our version על כל ישראל. Both are doxologies praying for peace on earth. But the New Testament formula puts peace on earth supplementing glory to Heaven (Compare Ps 8 2). The Jewish formula wishes for peace on earth as it is in heaven (cf. Matth 6 10b). A variant reading due to confusion of sound is וברחמי for ברחמי.

עשה שלום . . על is a pregnant usage combining the Biblical עשה שלום ב with the form common in greetings שלום על. עשה שלום is usually construed with ב,<sup>19</sup> sometimes with עם<sup>20</sup> and in a different sense with בין.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Ber 29b<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>18</sup> BAER p. 89 236. GASTER p. 31 117.

<sup>19</sup> TBER. 17 84 29 156.

<sup>20</sup> Yemen Cod. GAST 249. TBER. 29 156.

<sup>21</sup> TBER. 18 106 29 157 etc.

(γ)

ABUDARHAM

MODERN SPANISH

וְהַמְלִיךְ וְהַמְלִיכָה שְׁמוֹת רַבָּא

וְהָיָה עֲתִיד לְהַמְלִיךָ עָלֵינוּ

(e) וְהָיָה מִיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ

(e) אֶלְמַלְכֵּךְ מֵיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ מִיָּמֵינוּ

(d) וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה וְיִשְׁלָכֶם  
יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ

וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ

וְיִשְׁלָכֶם

(β)

MAIMONIDES

YEMEN

וְהַמְלִיךְ וְהַמְלִיכָה שְׁמוֹת רַבָּא

וְהָיָה עֲתִיד לְהַמְלִיךָ עָלֵינוּ

וְהָיָה מִיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ

וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ

וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁלָכֶם  
יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ

וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ

וְיִשְׁלָכֶם

וְיִשְׁלָכֶם

וְיִשְׁלָכֶם מִיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ

וְיִשְׁלָכֶם מִיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ

וְיִשְׁלָכֶם מִיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ

וְיִשְׁלָכֶם מִיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ

וְיִשְׁלָכֶם מִיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ

(α)

AMRAM

VITRY-RASHI

MODERN GERMAN

(below)

(a) וְהַמְלִיךְ וְהַמְלִיכָה שְׁמוֹת רַבָּא

(b) וְהַמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ  
וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ

(c) וְהַמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ

(d) וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ

(e) וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ  
וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ(f) וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ  
וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ(g) וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ  
וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ(h) וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ  
וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ(i) וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ  
וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ(j) וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ  
וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ(k) וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ  
וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ(l) וְלִמְלִיכָה קְרִיבָה מִיָּמֵינוּ  
וְלִשְׁכַּתְּנוּ לְהַמְלִיךָ



A variant to (α) b is בעלמא דעתיד להדתא of Soferim 19 12, and Tur Yore Deah 376 gives a version of (γ) varying in details. Old English mostly follows Maimonides *JQR* IV p. 54.

This version, known as the burial Kaddish or Kaddish להדתא (לאהדתא) from the first characteristic word, is, broadly speaking, the older simpler Kaddish with the Messianic insertions b. c. d. e. f. g. For dating it, the termini are the destruction of the second Temple 72 C. E. and Massecheth Soferim 7th—8th cent. It is impossible accurately to fix a date between these two limits and the most one can venture to say is that it is hardly earlier than the third or later than the seventh century.

This elaboration of the Kaddish is also in origin the דברי שבח<sup>1</sup> at the close of an Aggadic discourse, and very probably arose, if we need seek special grounds for its development, in differentiation from its simpler original, when the latter became an integral part of the synagogue service. When the older, simpler version had assumed its function in the synagogue with a definite place and meaning in the services, it was amplified in the study house with the comforting Messianic promises and hopes that recur again and again at the close of Aggadic study. And even the Halachic treatises of the Mishna often close with prayers for or references to the world to come<sup>2</sup> (b), the resurrection<sup>3</sup> (c), the rebuilding of Jerusalem<sup>4</sup> (d) and of the Temple<sup>5</sup> (e) and the approach of the Messiah<sup>6</sup> (h). This study-house use of the paragraph is undoubtedly original, although it was later applied as the graveside Kaddish and as the mourning Kaddish par excellence [Appendix F, p. 115].

Whereas the Hebrew prayer על הכל (Soferim 14 12) is strictly parallel to the ordinary Kaddish, the prayer יהי רצון<sup>7</sup> corresponds in three of its four paragraphs with the contents of the three para-

<sup>1</sup> Ber 31a<sub>28</sub> T. Ber 3 21 8 10 (text notes) J. Ber 5 8d 22.

<sup>2</sup> Talmud Tamid 33b MK. 29a Hull. 142a etc.

<sup>3</sup> Sota 9 15 MK. 3 9 Tosafoth MK. 28b top בלע.

<sup>4</sup> Aboth 5 20 reading שחבנה עירך. Derech Ereš Rabba.

<sup>5</sup> Taan 4 8 Aboth 5 20 reading שיבנה בית המקדש. Derech Ereš Zutā.

<sup>6</sup> Eduy. 8 7.

<sup>7</sup> Amram I 24a ( ), 33a [ ] BAER 124 GASTER 113 Roman 23b. See further pp. 92 and 98.

graphs of this version of the Kaddish: דהוא עתיד to לכוון (p. 97) and על ישראל to לקים (p. 98). The form differs largely owing to the "Systemzwang" of the יהי רצון framework. The similarity is least clear in the first verse יהי רצון מלפני [אלה] השמים (לרחם) [לכוון] את בית חיינו ולהשיב שכינתו לתוכו (במהרה בימינו) ואמרו אמן where only e. g. and j. are paralleled. The other two verses are far more closely related. The elaborate יקום פרקנא of the Yemen codex GASTER 243 f. 132a contains the phrase לשכללא היכלא ((e) and (d)). Various closing prayers offer parallels to this paragraph; e. g. the יהי רצון added after counting the 'Omer and after the Shemone 'Esre,<sup>8</sup> and the old מלכנו אלהינו<sup>9</sup> also closing the Shemone 'Esre and its variant in the Genizah fragment published by GASTER<sup>10</sup> שכלל היכלך (e) קרב משיחך (h) שכינתך תשב לבית (g) . . . הרחמן יוכנו לראות המשיח ולחיי העולם הבא (b) מקדשך (g) . . .

The paragraph, itself an expansion of the simpler Kaddish, has in its turn been poetically amplified. Dr. GASTER has published<sup>11</sup> a Genizah fragment, dating from not later than the 9th or 10th century that appears to be a poetical expansion of it, phrase by phrase, perhaps for the fast of Ab. The following extract shows its construction:

- (c) . . . כמא דאמיר על ידי עבדוהי נבייא לאחאה מיתא:  
 (d) ולמבני קרתא ירושלם. למבני יתה בניין עלם. . . . למבני קרתא ירושלם:  
 (e) ולשכללא היכלך. לשכללא יתה . . יקר שכינתיה. . . . שכינתיה להיכלא דקודשא כמא דאמיר על ידי עבדוהי נבו' לשכללא היכלא:  
 (f) ולמעקר פולחנא נוכרא. למעקר יתה מן שמיא ומן ארעא . . .  
 (g) . . . ויתובון כל עלמא . . . לפולחנא דקודשא ברוך הוא . . .  
 (h) . . . ותתגלי מלכותיה על כל יתבי ארעא . . . . ובכנ ימלך] מלכותיה ונ'.  
 (i) בהי'בון וכול'.

This text agrees on the whole most with version (α).

(b) The more explicitly dogmatic Messianic character of this version of the Kaddish is at once brought out in the qualification

<sup>8</sup> Meg 20b Tosafoth הלילה כל end. TBER. 18 95.

<sup>9</sup> Amram I 9a Vitry 67 BAER 104 p. 36 note 55.

<sup>10</sup> GDK. p. 238.

<sup>11</sup> GDK. 234 MGWJ XLVIII 1904 417 ff.

given to **בְּעֵלְמָא** instead of **דְּבֵרָא** of the simpler version. The characterisation "Messianic" is meant in the broadest sense (V. preface p. VII). Accurately speaking, Jewish eschatology usually pictures the earthly Messianic Kingdom as giving way, after a period, to the resurrection (c) and to the great judgment,<sup>12</sup> followed by the Kingdom of God.<sup>13</sup> The new heavens and new earth (b),<sup>14</sup> the *παλιγγένησις* or, as the Syriac version turns it, the **חֲלִיצַת מַלְאָכָא**,<sup>15</sup> follow the period of the kingdom of the Messiah.<sup>16</sup> According to R. Eleazar of Modin (2nd cent.)<sup>17</sup> the **עוֹלָם הַבָּא** is connected with the souls, the preceding **עוֹלָם הָרִשׁ** with the resurrection,<sup>18</sup> this giving (b) a very close connection with

(c) the resurrection.<sup>19</sup> This belief occurring sporadically in the Old Testament,<sup>20</sup> regularly in the New Testament<sup>21</sup> and in Hellenic and Pharisaic apocryphal works,<sup>22</sup> the Mishna<sup>23</sup> and Talmud<sup>24</sup> and Targum<sup>25</sup> hangs inseparably together with the Messianic hope. The "renewal of the world" (b) must necessarily include the revival of the dead for them to share in the Messianic glory. Sometimes the

<sup>12</sup> Dan 12 2 Enoch 98 10 103 s 104 5.

<sup>13</sup> The modern German addition to (c). Deut 30 19 J I. Hos 6 2 Targ.

<sup>14</sup> Isa 65 17 66 22 Exod Rab. 15 to Ex 12 2. Tanhuma to יוֹשֵׁעַ ed. BUBER 9. PREL. 51. Alphabet of R. Akiba (version B) letter Heh, JELL. BH. III p. 25. Cf. Deut. 32 1 J I with ib. J II. Eth. Enoch 45 4 f.

<sup>15</sup> Matth 19 28. Cf. 2 Pet. 3 13 Revel. 21 1, 5 20 11 Apoc. Baruch 32 6 44 12 57 2.

<sup>16</sup> Sanh. 92 b 1 97 b 16, 7000, 5000 etc. years.

<sup>17</sup> Mechilta p. 50 b to Exod 12 25.

<sup>18</sup> On **עוֹלָם הָרִשׁ** SCHÜRER GJV. II 636 ff. and literature there given. DWJ 145 f. J. KLAUSNER, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen des jüdischen Volkes*, Berlin '04 p. 18 ff.

<sup>19</sup> SCHÜRER GJV. II 638 et seq. Collected Jewish views on the resurrection ZUNZ, *Zur Geschichte* 372 et seq.

<sup>20</sup> Dan 12 2 Isa 26 19 Job 19 25 f. 14 13 f. Ezek 37 1 et seq. Compare 1 Kgs 17 22 2 Kgs 4 32—35 13 21. Contrast Ps 88 11, but also Ps 49 15 73 18—24. A **רָפוּ**, hint of it is found in Deut 32 34 (Sifre ib. p. 139 b), 33 6 a Num 23 10 b Hos 6 2.

<sup>21</sup> Luke 20 35 ff. John 5 29 Acts 24 15 1 Cor 6 14 2 Cor 1 9 etc.

<sup>22</sup> IV Macc 17 18 Wisdom 3 1—9 Ps of Solomon 3 16 Baruch 30 1—5 44 12 49—51 Enoch 22 51 1 f. and esp. 2 Macc 7 9 11 14 36 14 46 12 43—45.

<sup>23</sup> Aboth 4 22 Sota 9 15 end, cf. 1 Kgs 17 22.

<sup>24</sup> Sanh 90 b 28 et seq. Keth 8 b 20 J. Ber 4 2 7 d 26. Compare Shem. 'Esre 2. TBER. 5 29 151.

<sup>25</sup> Gen 19 26 J II Zach 3 7 Hos 6 2. See p. 63.



resurrection is pictured as taking place through Elijah<sup>26</sup> or the Messiah, but more usually, as here, through God who alone has the key to open the graves<sup>27</sup> at the end of the Messianic era.<sup>28</sup> The connection of this phrase (c) with (a) cannot be too closely drawn. As the Kaddish prays for the sanctification of God's Name through the resurrection, the resurrection is again and again described as having for its purpose the praise of God. In Ezek Ch 37 the foundation of the Rabbinical teaching on the resurrection, it is three times<sup>29</sup> emphasised that through it 'אני ה' וידעתם כי אני ה' and after the final defeat of Gog and Magog—והתגדלתי והתקדשתי—will come the resurrection. So in the TBER.<sup>30</sup> ובסוף שחיו . . . . . ונתגדל שמו בעולם מסוף העולם ועד סופו. ועל אותה שעה הוא אומר (Ezek 38 23) והתגדלתי והתקדשתי or תחיית המתים להקב"ה בעולם הזה כדי לקדש שמו הגדול ברוך אתה ה' מחיה המתים The Targum to the Shemone 'Esre<sup>31</sup> translates וישבחו קדמך ויברכו ית שמך ואמרו יהא שמיא רבא מברך דיכילתא לאחיאה מתיא.

(d) There is no attempt at putting the various eschatological ideas here enumerated into their chronological order a, h 2, d. e. f. g. b. c. h 1. In the Bible there are many references to God's building up Jerusalem, this also bringing honor and glory to His Name;<sup>32</sup> and after the destruction of the city by Titus and the building of the heathen city Aelia Capitolina on its site by Hadrian, the hopes of

<sup>26</sup> Sota 9 15 end. Compare 1 Kgs 17 22.

<sup>27</sup> Ezek 37 12 Ber 15b<sub>16</sub> Gen 30 22 J II. Alphabet of R. Akiba letter Zayyin JELL. BH. III 27 PREL. 34 Keth 8b<sub>23</sub> J. Ber 42 7d 26 Ber 60b<sub>27</sub> Taan 2a<sub>4</sub> Sanh 113<sub>g</sub>.

<sup>28</sup> Num 11 26 J I Deut 32 39 J II 1 Sam 2 6 2 Esdr 7 26—36 TBER. 3 14 5 21 18 93 107 TBEZ. 4 180.

<sup>29</sup> Ezek 37 6 13 14. Cf. Targ. Isa 42 11. Targ. to Shem. Esre quoted lower. Midrash Konan JELL. BH. II 36.

<sup>30</sup> TBER. 5 22 24 Num 11 26 J I.

<sup>31</sup> MGWJ. XXXIX 1894 85.

<sup>32</sup> Ps 102 14—17 Ps 51 20 where הַיִּטְבָּה seems to be a technical term for rebuilding so as to improve and beautify. Compare the Zenjirli inscription of Barrekub bar Panammu l. 12 וְאַחַת בֵּית אֲבִי וְהַטְבָּתָּה כֵּן בֵּית מַלְכֵּן רִבְרֵן and that of Panammu l. 9 בֵּית אֲבִי וְהַטְבָּתָּה SACHAU, *Mittheilungen aus den orientalischen Sammlungen* Heft 11 p. 25. Berl. '93. Ps 147 2. Compare Sirach 36 17 f. Isa 51 3 52 9 54 11 f. 61 3 f.

the consolation (נחמה)<sup>33</sup> and rebuilding of the New Jerusalem<sup>34</sup> loomed most prominently in the hopes for the future, and find expression at every opportunity.<sup>35</sup> Almost invariably the prayer for Jerusalem (d) is coupled with

(e) the prayer for the rebuilding of the Temple. God will rebuild His Temple,<sup>36</sup> described by Ezekiel (40—48), through His anointed.<sup>37</sup> The nations of the earth will forsake their idols and go up to the House of the God of Jacob to learn of His ways (f),<sup>38</sup> for the service of God will be restored to the Temple once more (g).<sup>39</sup>

דְּהוּא and דְּעֵתִיד better than דְּי. Compare Galilean and Samaritan דוּ for דְּהוּא.

עֵתִיד better than the usual עֵתִיד—a Hebraism,—in form Part. Pass. Peal. לְ עֵתִיד in the Targum, as סוֹף with ל or a participle or סוֹף עֵתִיד, is constantly used for expressing certain futurity.<sup>41</sup> Cf. לעתיד לבוא “to the future world”.

לְחִדְתָּא more original than לְאַתְחִדְתָּא. The Targum in two passages—Mic 7 14 לאתחדתא עתיד דהוא בעלמא and Deut 32 1 JI simi-

<sup>33</sup> Isa 52 9 66 13 Zach 1 17 Sirach 36 13 f. Targ. Isa 33 20 51 3 4 3. Ber 48 b 20 נחמה referring to the paragraph על ציון (רחם) נחם and ברוחמי ירושלם and נחם ציון בנביא. Sofer 13 12 the Haftarah blessing מנחם ציון עירך . . . מנחם ציון בנביא. שמחתה של ירושלם ונחומותיה. See p. 64.

<sup>34</sup> Isa 54 11 f. Zech 2 6—9 14—16 8 3—5 Revel 21 10 et seq. Tobit 13 16—18 14 5 Enoch 90 28 f. JELL. BH. III p. 69. 74 f. SCHÜRER GJV. II 625 f. gives literature. Apoc. Baruch 6 9.

<sup>35</sup> Ber 44 a 7 J Ber 42 7 d 19 TBER. 14 63 Shem. 'Esre 14 17 (ELBOGEN p. 525). The Palestinian version (S. SCHECHTER JQR. X 1898 p. 657) reads in one text בנה ביתך שכלל היכלך הבינו. (BAER 108). Service for the 9th Ab (Taan. 29 b) והוא יבנה אבות בימינו. Further note 33 above. Aboth 5 20 Soferim 14 12 ויהא ביתך שכלל היכלך הבינו. (BAER p. 96). Further note 33 above.

<sup>36</sup> Isa 60 7 Hag 2 7 9 Taan 4 8 Aboth 5 20 Tobit 14 5 Enoch 90 28 f. Derech Eres Zutṭa end. Shem. 'Esre 17 (ELBOGEN 526) JELL. BH. III 69 74 f. Further note 33 and 35 above.

<sup>37</sup> Zach 6 12 f. and Targ.

<sup>38</sup> Isa 2 3 18 Mic 4 2 Zach 13 2 Tobit 14 6. The second half (על כן) עלינו (BAER p. 132). New Year liturgy (German) DWJ. Anhang 306. Cant. Rab. to 2 13 p. 17 c.

<sup>39</sup> Shemone 'Esre 17 והשב העבודה לדביר ביתך Midr. Ps 17 2 ed. BUB. p. 127 והשב שכינתך לציון וסדר העבודה לירושלם (ELBOGEN, Shem. 'Esre 527).

<sup>40</sup> Targum ed. Sabionetta, Lisbon etc.

<sup>41</sup> Gen 4 7 10 Onk. Exod J I 1 15 3 5 10 7 etc. D. Gr. 268.

larly, reads the Ithpaal, but in Habak 3 2 עלמא ר.אמרת לחדתא. In Onkelos to Deut 32 12 the MSS. and editions vary between the Pael and Ithpaal.<sup>42</sup> With the Ithpaal הוא refers to עלמא, thus laying unwarranted emphasis on עלמא and leaving ב out of connection with the following phrases c. d. e. etc. With the Pael הוא God is the subject of all the following verbs. The later change to the Passive is apparently in accordance with the scrupulous spirit of the Targum to avoid attributing the action of the renewal directly to God.<sup>43</sup> חַדַּת (ŁDZB. 271) is a denominative. Old English לחדשא.

וְלִאֲחֲזָה<sup>44</sup> is perhaps the best orthography, pronounced as the later more popular spelling אֲחִיָּה;<sup>45</sup> אֲחִיָּה<sup>46</sup> and אֲחִיָּה<sup>47</sup> also occur. The form in Biblical Aramaic is לְהִחְיֶה.<sup>48</sup> The punctuation אֲחִיָּה also occurs in Yemenite texts.<sup>49</sup> Old English ולמחמא (!).

מִיָּתִיָּה Most Targum editions and some MSS. and editions of the Kaddish prefer מִיָּתִיָּה<sup>50</sup> possibly hinting at מִיָּתִיָּה from אתא 'the coming ones.'

וְלִמְפָּרֵךְ So Onk. and Proph. Targ. ולמפּוּרֵךְ often in Jer. Targ.

חִיָּיָה as in Dan 2 30 4 14. Most editions and Targ. edit. חִיָּיָה.

וְלִאֲפָקָה Afel Inf. of פָּקַח with Daghesh in פ. Cf. Dan 6 24 להִנְסֶקָה.

יִתְהוֹן Dan 3 12 better than יִתְהוֹן.<sup>51</sup>

מִסִּיק מִשְׁאוֹל לְחַיִּי based on Dan 12 2. Amram II 21 b לחַיִּי עֲלֵמָה

<sup>42</sup> Bologna 1482, Vienna, and two MSS. (1185 CE. and 1439 CE.) quoted by LEVY *TWB*. חַדַּת. read the Pael. Edit. Sabionetta, the Lisbon 1491 editions and modern editions have the Ithpaal.

<sup>43</sup> So ADLER לִנְרָה to Deut 32 12.

<sup>44</sup> Amram, Rashi (Vitry), Yemen, Yemen Genizah fragment. Targum Cod. Reuchl. Isa 38 16 2 Sam 8 2 1 Sam 2 6 Exod 13 17 J II ed. GINSBURGER שָׁן עֲתִיר. לאחזא מִיָּתִיָּה.

<sup>45</sup> Maimonides.

<sup>46</sup> Abudarham. Targum Isa 38 16 BUXTORF. Tur.

<sup>47</sup> Targ. Isa 38 16 ed. Venice 1517.

<sup>48</sup> Dan 2 10 16 27 3 32 5 15 one Yemen MS. Qre. להחַיֶּה. STRACK to Dan 2 10.

<sup>49</sup> D. Gr. 353 355 60 98.

<sup>50</sup> JASTROW, LANDSHUTH etc. Num 17 13 Onk.—not ed. Sab. and Lisbon. REUCHL. 2 Kgs 19 35.

<sup>51</sup> MERX, *Bemerkungen über die Vocalisation der Targume* (Verhandlung des 5ten internat. Orientalisten-Congresses 145, 185. NÖLDEKE, *Mand. Gram.* 92. 390. WRIGHT, *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic languages* 112. BERLINER, Onkelos II 148. BEVAN, Daniel 38.



עלמא better than Targ. 1 Sam 2 6 עלמא where עלמא may mean דאתי עלמא as often.<sup>52</sup> Both חיי עלמא דאתי<sup>53</sup> and (חיי העולם הבא) חיי עלמא דאתי<sup>54</sup> occur, the latter more frequently.

למבנא better than Yemen ולמבנא although Ezr 5 2 17 has למבנא<sup>55</sup> since in later orthography א is usually mater lectionis for the vowel ā.<sup>56</sup>

קרְתָא NÖLDEKE, *Beiträge zur semit. Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 62, note 1; BARTH, *ZDMG.* XLI 1887, 607. קרְתָא followed by a name is usually constructed with 7<sup>57</sup> but often (hebraizing?) without it.<sup>58</sup>

דירושלם So BAER and GINSBURG. STRACK דירושלם as many MSS. STRACK to Ezr 4 8.

ולְשַׁבְּלָא in Biblical Aram ולְשַׁבְּלָא<sup>59</sup> to finish building walls<sup>60</sup> or the Temple.<sup>61</sup> In the Targumim it is used in this sense also<sup>62</sup> and in the rather more general sense of to build up<sup>63</sup> as here, or to lay the foundations.<sup>64</sup>

הִיכְלָא So Biblical Aramaic<sup>65</sup> and Syriac ܫܠܬܐ better than the hebraizing form usually found הִיכְלָא.

<sup>52</sup> Targ Lev 18 5 Isa 58 11 Ezek 20 11 13 21 compared with Deut 30 19 J I.

<sup>53</sup> Aboth 2 7 Sanh 10 2

<sup>54</sup> Dan 12 2 Lev 18 5 O. J I Deut 33 6 O. 1 Sam 25 29 Ezek 20 11 13 21 Ps Sol 13 9 14 2. Cf. Enoch 103 3 f. In the New Testament ζαχαρίας 40 times. Sofer 13 8 DWJ. 127 f.

<sup>55</sup> Besides למבנא Ezr 5 9 (cf. DG 340 349) and לבנא Ezr 5 3 13. This latter form too in inscriptions e. g. Hadad l. 11 13. SAYCE-COWLEY Egypt. Aram. has למבנא A 3 6 9 11 C 14. <sup>56</sup> D. Gr. 339 349.

<sup>57</sup> קרְתָא דירושלם Amr., Rashi, Maim., Tur. Isa 10 32 REUCHL. margin and editions. Cf. Gen 33 18 J I 49 7 J II Esth II 8 15 ed. David p. 44 3 9 ib. 1 1 p. 211.

<sup>58</sup> קרְתָא דירושלם Abud., Yemen, Genizah fragment Isa 10 32 REUCHL. Cf. Gen 33 18 ONK.

<sup>59</sup> Ezr 5 3 9. The Inf. Pael ending in א occurs only in לבְּלָא Ezr 4 21 6 8 לִיבְּלָא Dan 7 19 and perh. Kethibh לחטא Ezr 6 17 D. Gr. 250 f. 281.

<sup>60</sup> Ezra 4 12 13 16 5 3 9.

<sup>61</sup> Ezra 5 11 6 14 and 5 3 9, if אשְׁרָא is connected with Assyrian ašru sanctuary as PAUL HAUPT suggests in GUTHE's Ezra. Cf. אשְׁרָא a part of the temple, SACHAU, *Die Aram. Papyrusurkunden* 1 11.

<sup>62</sup> Gen 2 1 Exod 31 17 J I Deut 20 5 J I Ezek 27 11 Am 9 11 1 Chr 4 23.

<sup>63</sup> Ps 51 20. <sup>64</sup> Zech 8 9 Hab 2 12 1 Sam 2 8 2 Sam 22 8 Isa 42 5.

<sup>65</sup> NÖLDEKE, *Mand. Gram.* 135 § 113 RECKENDORF, *ZDMG.* XLII 1888 p. 399 BARTH, *NB.* § 264 d p. 423 note 2 Ges. KAUTZSCH, *Hebr Gram.* 85 c LAGARDE,

קדִישָׁא וְיִקְרָא added in the Yemen version can be defended by the apparent usage in Biblical Aramaic where the two meanings of היכלא "palace" and "temple" always appear to be purposely kept distinct from each other by qualifying additions. היכלא as temple is היכלא די בית אלהא די בירושלם (Ezr 5 14a 15 6 5 5), היכלא די בירושלם (Dan 5 3). היכלא as royal palace is מלכא די היכלא (Dan 5 5), (מלכא) היכל מלכותא, (Dan 4 1) בביתי parallel to בהיכלי (Dan 6 19), להיכלא (Dan 4 26). מלח היכלא מלחנא (Ezr 4 14) is speaking of the king. According to this Ezra 5 14b c היכלא די בבל is temple in Babylon as בירושלם די היכלא temple in Jerusalem, in contrast with היכל מלכותי די בבל the palace in Babylon.

בִּנְיָה So Ezra 4 15 better than ed. Sabionetta etc. בִּנְיָה. On RECKENDORF, *ZDMG.* XLII, 1888 p. 413. LDZB. 249.

וְלִמְעִיקָר The reading of the Maḥzor Vitry וְלִמְעִיקָר is not necessarily Pael or a scribe's mistake for ולמעיקר. In verba prima gutt. esp. prima ע the first syllable of the Inf. Peal is often opened in superlinear texts and ed. Sabionetta, giving forms like מְעִיבָר Deut 27 12 Num 20 21 (J I מעיבר) or מִיעִיבָר. Gen 19 20 Sab מִיעֶרֶק. Deut 24 8 Sab., מְעִבָר editions, contrasting with the closed syllable in Biblical Aramaic מְעִבָר (Ezra 4 22 7 18).<sup>66</sup> With closed syllable the vowel of the prefix מ may be *a*, *e* or *i*.<sup>67</sup> On עקר BARTH, *ES.* 6.

פִּלְחָנָא נִכְרָאָה On פולחן see above on פורקן p. 37. BARTH, *NB.* § 194b p. 318 p. XXIX note 1. פולחנא נוכראה<sup>68</sup> or as pronounced פ' נוכריא<sup>69</sup> is the regular equivalent of the Hebrew עבודה זרה strange service i. e. idolatry, or the idol itself. The former meaning is

*Uebersicht* 121 9 DELITZSCH, *Assyr. WB.* following OPPERT, êkallu from the Sumerian ê-gal large house.

<sup>66</sup> STRACK to Ezra 7 18 notes a superlinear MS with מְעִבָר.

<sup>67</sup> BARTH *NB.* § 161b p. 243 DGr. 93 f. 279 f.

<sup>68</sup> J I Gen 21 9 15 f. 26 35 Exod. 6 9 17 8 32 18 27 Num 23 1 35 25 Deut 25 18 32 12. Cf. S. LANDAUER, *Das Elif als mater lectionis im jüd. Aram.*, Festschrift Abraham Berliner's p. 220 f. D. Gr. 98 177 194.

<sup>69</sup> J II Gen 4 26 21 9, J I Exod 32 6, Deut 32 16 J II נוכריא cf. ver. 12 Deut 14 1 J II פולחנא נוכריא, GINSBURGER נוכראין. The א in נוכראי is only a mater lectionis to avoid reading נוכרי.

required here. נוכראי (זר) is the technical term for that which is alien to the religious laws, contrary to ritual prescription.<sup>70</sup>

דאִלִּיא is a late reading for נוכראה (ed. princ.) due to the censorship, just as עבודה זרה is in most printed works changed to פולחנא נוכראה דפלחי כוכביא. Editions of the Tur read עבודת אלילים. Although the word does occur rarely in the Targum (e. g. Lev 12 J I), it is not a usual Aramaic word, אלילים being invariably translated by the Targumist as מעוותא.

מארעא The Masora to Onk Exod 12 37 would require מארעא, being a Hebraism. מן־מארעא avoids the hiatus and removes the difficulty. ארעא here meant originally the "land"—Palestine. This is meant by מארעיה in Amram and the Tur. It was especially Palestine that was polluted by idolatry (Zech 13 2). The national restoration is here primarily intended, but secondarily also the universalistic, the complete extirpation of idolatry from the earth. Old English, however, reads מארענא.

ולאִתְבָּא So the superlinear pointing.<sup>71</sup> The sublinear is the more regular ולִאתְבָּא.

פִּלְחָנָא דְשִׁמְיָא the original form. The fuller forms פִּרְשֵׁיא דִּשׁ פִּרְשֵׁיא דִּשׁ, פִּרְשֵׁיא דִּשׁ, or פִּלְחָנָא דִּשׁ—not פִּלְחָנָא in the construct as mostly in the superlinear texts<sup>72</sup>—emphasize the contrast with נוכראה. פולחנא נוכראה. The reading דְשִׁמְיָא for דְשִׁמְיָא in Abud. and Yemenite texts possibly goes back to an orthography דְשִׁמְיָא for דְשִׁמְיָא, naturally read as דְשִׁמְיָא. But as the wording of prayers was transmitted orally, it is also possibly an original variant. The reading שְׁמִיָּה appearing in almost all the Yemen texts—Cod. Gast. 4 reads שְׁמִיָּה with the two vowel signs שְׁמִיָּה rubbed out—is further assured by the Yemenite Targum to the parallel passage in the Shemone 'Esre 17, which translates והשב העבודה as וְלִשְׁמֹךְ דִּי פולחנא דִּי לשְׁמֹךְ.

לִתְהִירָה, לִתְהִירָה in the mouth of an oriental are scarcely to be distinguished, the ה being very lightly aspirated, and ד and ת both softly pronounced very much as the Arabic ḥ. Hence it is impossible to say which of the two is original, although the context

<sup>70</sup> Exod 30 9 Lev 10 1 Num 3 4 26 61 Onk. and Jer to זרה.

<sup>71</sup> MEX, *Chrestomathia* תוב D. Gr. 316 324.

<sup>72</sup> PRÄTORIUS Joshua 7 5 D. Gr. 7 9.



might be regarded as slightly favouring *לאתריה*.<sup>73</sup> The Yemen version combines both *בהדריה* *לאתריה* *להרריה* 'to its glory' rather than 'for His glory'. Old English *לאחרא*.

*יָקָרָה*, *וַיִּוְהָ*<sup>74</sup> and *הדריה* are quite synonymous. The Targum in avoidance of anthropomorphism or anthropopathism uses 'יקרא דה' (= 'כבוד ה') or *ויו יקרא דה'* equally. J I prefers 'יקר שכינתא דה', and the Tur reads here *ווייה ויקריה ושכינתיה* *הדר* in Deut 33 17 is *ויו* in Onk, *הדרת אקרא* in J I, *ויקרא והדרא* in J II. *יָקָר* occurring often in the later parts of the Old Testament is recognised by R. Naḥman b. Isaac (280—356) as Aramaic.<sup>75</sup>

*יְחֻדָּה* of the superlinear texts<sup>76</sup> is perhaps a better form.

*וַיְמַלֵּךְ* the modern German reading is a confusion of *וַיְמַלֵּךְ* and *בְּמַלְכוּתָהּ*.

*הָא שְׁעָתָא* contracted from *הַשְּׁעָתָא*.

*עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל וְעַל-רַבָּנָן וְעַל-תַּלְמִידֵיהוֹן וְעַל-כָּל-תַּלְמִידֵי תַלְמִידֵיהוֹן דְּעַשְׁקִין*  
*בְּאַחֲרֵיתָא קְדִישָׁתָא דְּבִצְתָרָא הָדִין וְדִבְכַל-אַתְרָא וְאַתְרָא יְהֵא [לְנָא וְלֵהוֹן] תְּנָא וְתַסְדָּא*  
*וְרַחֲמֵי מִן קָדָם מְרִי שְׁמֵיָא וְאַרְעָא וְאַמְרוּ אָמֵן*. Abudarham. Mod. Spanish [ ].  
 For the opening words Maimonides has only *ועל רבנן* and *ועל רבנן* is inserted in the modern German and in some Yemen texts. Maimonides omits *קדישתא* as do some Yemenite texts. The modern German inserts *ועל-כל-מן* (דעסקין). Carpentras, Spanish (ed. Livorno 1791), Maimonides MS. GASTER 173 *דיתבין ועסקין*. Maimonides, Roman and Mod. German read *יהא להון ולכון*. Yemen also, or *לכון ולהון ולנא* or *לכון ולהון* etc.<sup>1</sup> Yemen reads also *ורחמי* and *ורחמי* after them. Maimonides adds *שלמא* before them and *ומווני רויחין* after them. Maimonides adds *שלמא רבא חנ' וחס' ורחמין*. Mod. German reads *ורחמין*.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Ezr 6 5 5 15. Cf. SACHAU l. c. p. 41.

<sup>74</sup> NÖLDEKE, ZDMG. XL 1886 p. 732.

<sup>75</sup> Meg 9a 17 KAUTZSCH, *Aramäismen* p. 38 BARTH, NB. 88c D. Gr. 100 155. Assyrian *akru* is 'precious, valuable'.  
<sup>76</sup> D. Gr. 85 92 164.

<sup>1</sup> Kohut's Yemen text *להון ולכון*. Yemen Or. 2418 *להון ולכון*. Spanish ed. Livorno 1791 *לנא ולהון ולכון*. Carpentras as mod. Spanish ed. *לנא ולהון*. Spanish ed. princ. *להון*. Some Yemen texts *לכון* etc.

מרי שמיא וארעא<sup>3</sup> Maimonides, For<sup>2</sup> וחיי אריכין ומוזנא רויחא ופורקנא, mod. German and KOHUT's Yemen text read רבשמיא אבוהון Yemen as both of these or דב' or אכונא or וארעא מימרא דשמיא.

This paragraph, recited in the Kaddish at the end of a lesson is an appropriate wish for blessing on all teachers who uphold and transmit the traditional teachings. יקום פורקן<sup>4</sup>, the old Babylonian formula used for the same purpose, is practically the same:<sup>5</sup>

קריש (German)	יקום פורקן
[על ישראל ו]על רבנן	... למרנן ורבנן ...
ועל תלמידיהון ועל כל תלמידי תלמידיהון	ולכל תלמידיהון ולכל תלמידי תלמידיהון
ועל כל מן דעסקין באוריתא	וכל מן דעסקין באוריתא ...
דבאתרא הדין ודבכל אתר ואחר	... דבארעא דישראל ודבבבל
יהא להון [ולכון] חנא וחסדא ורחמי	... חנא וחסדא ורחמי וחיי אריכי
וחיי אריכי ומוזנא רויחא.	ומוזני רויחי וסיעתא ...
ופרקנא מן קדם אבוהון דבשמיא	... יקום פורקן מן שמיא ...
ואמרו אמן	... ונאמר אמן

יקום פורקן has a considerable excess of words over this paragraph of the Kaddish, several of which however can be paralleled in other versions or parts of the Kaddish; e. g. Maimonides = סיעתא in יקום פרקן. The addition of לרישי גלותא ולרישי לרישי כלי ולרישי גלותא in יקום פורקן is found in the old Kaddish (p. 18) in the mention of the ראש הישיבה and ראש גלות, where

<sup>2</sup> Spanish ed. Livorno 1791 adds וחיי אריכין ומוזני רויחין. A Maimonides MS (GASTER 173) reads חנא וחסדא ורחמי [וחיי] אריכי ומוזני וסיעתא דשמיא ובריות נופא. גופא מימרא דשמיא יהא בסעדנא ובסעדכון בכל זמן ועדן ואמרו אמן.

<sup>3</sup> Abudarham, Spanish, Carpentras, Roman, Old Yemen texts. The Spanish version ed. Livorno 1791 reads וארעא דשמיא מרי דשמיא. For מרי often מריה and מאריה.

<sup>4</sup> Vitry p. 172 BAER 229 f. S. L. RAPOPORT, *Biography of Nathan b. Yechiel* Note 29. It runs as follows: (BAER) יקום פורקן מן שמיא חנא וחסדא ורחמי וחיי אריכי ומוזני רויחי וסיעתא דשמיא ובריות נופא ונהורא מעליא זרעא חייא וקיימא זרעא דלא יפסוק ודלא יבטול מפתגמי אוריתא למרנן ורבנן חבורתא קדישתא דבארעא דישראל ודבבבל לרישי כלי ולרישי גלותא ולרישי מתיבתא ולדיני דבבא, לכל תלמידיהון ולכל תלמידי תלמידיהון ולכל מן דעסקין באוריתא מלכא דעלמא יברך יתהון יפיש חייהון ויסני יומיהון ויתן ארכא לשניהון ויתפרקון וישתובון מן כל עקא ומן כל מרעין בישון מרן דבשמיא יהא בסעדנהון כל זמן ועדן ונאמר אמן.

<sup>5</sup> Based on LANDSHUTH בקור חולים p. LX.

also the three heads of the *חבורתא* = *חבורה* are called *חבורתא* = *חבורה*. The phrase *ויתפרקון וישתובון מן כל עקא ומן כל מרעין בישין* has its counterpart in the Kaddish in the paragraph *תתכלי* (p. 97).<sup>6</sup> The real difference between the two formulae is that the Kaddish is universal and *יקום פורקן* local. Certainly the phrase *רבאתרא הדין* *רבאתרא* *הדין* in the Kaddish looks more like an adaptation of the corresponding phrase in *יקום פורקן* than an original expression; and because of the local color in *יקום פורקן* it has been assumed<sup>7</sup> that the Kaddish formula is a later adaptation of it. But even assuming that *יקום פורקן* as we have it in the Mahzor Vitry has been expanded, it would still be hard to see why the Kaddish omitted some phrases, and found it necessary to alter the order and construction of the sentences. This consideration also bars the assumption of *יקום פורקן* being an adaptation of the Kaddish formula. It is therefore probable that both are independent developments from a common original. This original would appear to date from post Talmudic times, and is possibly early Gaonic. This paragraph, not in Amram, perhaps dates from later than 900.

*על ישראל* The only excess of the Kaddish over *יקום פורקן* lies in the two words *על ישראל*, which are out of place at the head of this blessing for the *רבנן* but have never been explained. Furthermore Maimonides, old English and KOHUT's Yemen text do not know them, but commence the paragraph *על רבנן*. There is a second formula *יקום פורקן*, a prayer for the congregation, running as the one for the teachers except for the words *קדישא קדישא* (*... מפתנמי אוריתא*) לכל קהלא *על רבנן* etc. with the second pers. plur. suffix *הון*—for that of the 3rd pers. pl. *הון*. In the Mahzor Vitry p. 172 these two formulae are combined into one. It is obvious therefore that our version of the paragraph beginning *על ישראל ועל רבנן* unites both these formulae in one. The formula beginning *על ישראל* and reading *יהא לכון* (which otherwise

<sup>6</sup> The form in the Kaddish Maimonides MS. GASTER 173 running *הנא וחסדא ורחמי* [וחי] *אריכי ומווני וסייעתא דשמיא ובריאות גופא מימרא דשמיא יהא בסעדנא ובסעדכון* is almost literally the same as the beginning and end of *יקום פורקן*.

<sup>7</sup> RAPOPORT חמד III 1838 p. 46 and following him LANDSHUTH l. c. HAMBURGER, *Real-Encykl.* II 606.



comes very abruptly and is bracketed by BAER etc.) corresponds with the congregational **יקום פורקן**; and in so far as it begins על **רבנן** and reads **יהא לחון** it corresponds with the rabbinical **יקום פורקן**. This paragraph is therefore a combined prayer both for the congregation (of Israel) and its teachers.

The parallel paragraph of **יהי רצון**<sup>8</sup> (the third) running **מלפני [אלהי] השמים לקיים לנו את כל חכמי ישראל הם ובניהם ותלמידיהם**<sup>9</sup> **אמן**<sup>10</sup> to the Kaddish paragraph, has nothing corresponding with the words על ישראל.

**ועל-רבנן** not, as usually **רבנן**. **רבן** is itself a nominal form and is not to be regarded with GEIGER<sup>11</sup> as **רב** with the suffix of the 1st pers. plur., which would be **רבן**. It occurs in the Targum<sup>12</sup> and has an uncertain history.<sup>13</sup> According to the general tradition<sup>14</sup> **רבן** is a higher title than **רבי**. T. Eduy 3 4 460 4, implying the same, defines **רבי** as a teacher whose disciples are known, **רבן** one of earlier date whose disciples are already forgotten. In actual usage the title is in Palestine first given to the Patriarchs Gamliel I (30—40 C. E. Acts 22 3), then to his son Simeon, his grandson Gamliel of Yabne (90—110 C. E.) and his great grandson Simeon (fl. 140) After him the Patriarch is called **נשיא** and the title **רבן** loses its official meaning. R. Yohanan b. Zaccai, the foremost teacher at the time of the destruction of the Temple is also known as **רבן**. It was used later in the weakened sense of "rabbi, teacher" and applied to any distinguished teacher,<sup>15</sup> and particularly the Exilarch or chief Baby-

<sup>8</sup> Amram I 24a ( ), 33a [ ]. GASTER 113 BAER 124 ROMAN 23b. See p. 80 note 7 and p. 98.

<sup>9</sup> In the modern German text expanded to **ותלמידיהם ותלמידי תלמידיהם** as in the Kaddish and **יקום פורקן**.

<sup>10</sup> In the modern German text **וונאמר** as in **יקום פורקן**.

<sup>11</sup> GEIGER, *Was hat Mohammed* p. 51.

<sup>12</sup> LEVY, *TWB*.

<sup>13</sup> LEVY, *NHWB*. KOHUT, *Aruch Completum* I אביי p. 6. Aboth 1 16 et seq. SCHÜRER, *GJV*. II 376 *DWJ*. 272.

<sup>14</sup> From a response of Sherira Gaon. KOHUT's *Aruch Completum* I אביי p. 6. AD. NEUBAUER, *Anecdota Oxoniensa Preface* p. XII.

<sup>15</sup> Shab 33b <sup>16</sup> 119b <sup>19</sup> AZ. 3b <sup>21</sup> **רבן** בית רבן. J. Ter 8 7 46a <sup>38</sup> JBM. 2 13 8d <sup>40</sup> J. Sanh 10 1 27d <sup>11</sup> Targ. Cant 65 Ps 80 <sup>11</sup> Eccl 5 7.

lonian teacher was called רבנא.<sup>16</sup> The suffixed form רבנן is used regularly as חכמים in the Mishna in the wide sense of "teachers" in expressions like רבנן דקיסרין, צורבא דרבנן, ההוא מרבנן, מדרבנן, the suffix being as meaningless as it is in רבין, רבין.<sup>17</sup>

In form רבנן is contracted from רבננא. The plural רבנן occurs only in the Palestinian dialect. But the suffix of the first pers. plur. added to the plural is in Galilean as in Samaritan ינן—which would give the form רבננין—Compare Syriac ܪܒܢܐ and Biblical Aram. ינא.—The absence of the Yod in the form רבנן must point to an original suffix נא— as in Onkelos (Sabionetta and the editions נא—). In the Jer. Targ. occur both נא— and נן—.<sup>18</sup>

ועל כל תלמידיהו ועל תלמידי תלמידיהו The expression, including two generations of pupils, is modelled on Isa 59 21<sup>19</sup> תלמיד 20 is defined<sup>21</sup> as כל ששואלין אותו דבר הלכה בתלמודו ואומר.

מן Cf. ܡܢ, the superlinear punctuation, GINSBURG (Dan 3 15) many MSS. (STRACK to Dan 3 6), MARTI § 27 Note, BEVAN, Daniel p. 39 etc., better than מן favored by BAER and the editions. The orthography מאן is only to distinguish it from the preposition מן.<sup>22</sup> The use of—מן for the simple relative is more characteristic of the Jer. Targ. than of Onkelos.

יתב דיתבין ועשקין is often used specifically for sitting down to study (Targ. Isa 1 3) or lecture, ישב ועסק ב—, ישב ודרש.<sup>23</sup> Yemen Cod. GASTER 249 reads עסקין דאנון עסקין.

עשקין is better in a pointed text than עסקין. The ם is used constantly for ש in New Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic to avoid misreading as ש.<sup>24</sup> The root עשק, in Biblical Hebrew Hithpaël

<sup>16</sup> Pes 115b 8 רבנא עוקבא Keth 22a 12 רבנא אשי.

<sup>17</sup> Compare Monsieur, Monsignor, Mijnheer etc.

<sup>18</sup> D. Gr. 95 108 174 204.

<sup>19</sup> BM. 85a 11.

<sup>20</sup> NÖLDEKE, ZDMG. XL 1886 727 Note 3 1 Chr 25 s D. Gr. 172.

<sup>21</sup> Ta'an 10b 2 D. S. LEVY, NHWB. פ'לה.

<sup>22</sup> LANDAUER, in *Abraham Berliner's Festschrift* 1903 pp. 215—226.

<sup>23</sup> Passage D (p. 9). Often as in יושב ודרש יושב ודרש, מעשה באדם אחד שהיה יושב ודרש. Eccl. Rab. to 6 2 יתיב ודריש בהדין פסוקא Gen. Rab. 5 7 שהיה ר' ישמעאל יושב ודרש יתיב ודריש J. Ber 2 1 4b 35 etc.

<sup>24</sup> (שפך 1Kgs 20 10) ספק, (ארש. Bibl.) ארם, (יחש. Bibl.) יחם, (שחט. Bibl.) סחט, (שמה. Num 5 12) סוטה, (שהרותא. Bibl.) סהד, (שנה. Bibl.) סני, (שכר. Ezr 4 5) סכר (cf. Ezr 4 5 for שכר),





occur very frequently together<sup>34</sup> owing in a large measure to the alliteration of the ח, which sometimes attracts to them also חין (אריכין). On חסדא see NÖLD., *Mand. Gram.* p. 14 § 16. D., *Gr.* 88 138. βηθεδεζ John 5 2, if this be the correct reading, would point to חסדא—Compare חסדא. In New Testament times ā in a closed syllable,<sup>35</sup> as here, was largely pronounced as such: πάχα<sup>36</sup> βαββουί<sup>37</sup> are the later פסחא—compare פסחא. So too רבי is found later often as רבי. On the other hand Luke 1 15 αἰσρα is שְׂכָרָא. The older pronunciation would therefore seem to be חסדא combining both Pathah and Seghol. Many editions e. g. Spanish ed. princ. (owing to the guttural ח?) point חסדא. But the best editions—superlinear, Sabionetta, Reuchlin, Lisbon etc.—read חסדא.<sup>38</sup> A better pronunciation may be חסדא. In Syriac ܚܫܐ is disgrace, ܚܫܐ grace according to GREGORY BAR HEBRAEUS.<sup>39</sup>—רחמן—Sabionetta Exod 11 3 רחמן or רחמי. This shortened plural in ē occurs in Assyrian, Old Aramaic inscriptions,<sup>40</sup> especially frequently in Mandaeic,<sup>41</sup> apparently also in the New Testament names Βηθεζαχ (Matth 21 1) ביתפני and Γεθσημανε (Matth 26 36) גת שמני,<sup>42</sup> and in Onkelos.<sup>43</sup> On the form רחמן and its meaning NÖLDEKE, *ZDMG.* XL 1886 151 Note 5.

חין אריכין The root ארך to be long is used mostly of time, and אריכין (ארוכים) commonly occurs with חין (חיים)<sup>44</sup> According to NÖLDEKE, *ZDMG.* XL 1886, 724 the root meaning of ארך may be “old.” Assyr. *arāku* to be long.

רומא רומא The plural form רומא of the Roman and

<sup>34</sup> Ber 29b<sub>2</sub> 60b<sub>14</sub> Sofer 14 12 Amr. I 55 etc. etc.

<sup>35</sup> The LXX often shows *a* in such cases, where the Masoretic text has *i*.

<sup>36</sup> Josephus. Matth 26 2 etc.

<sup>37</sup> Mark 10 51 John 20 16.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Git 7a<sub>13</sub> מילך וחסדאין שמך וחסדאין מילך.

<sup>39</sup> BAR HEBRAEUS, John 5 2 *ZDMG.* XXXII 1878 750. Compare D. *Gr.* 189

<sup>40</sup> The Hadad inscription (8th cent. B. C.) l. 5 שְׁעִי l. 31 אַבְנִי etc. NÖLDEKE. *ZDMG.* XXIV 1870 100. SACHAU, ib. XXXVII 1883 566.

<sup>41</sup> NÖLDEKE, *Mand. Gram.* p. 161 § 131. p. 305.

<sup>42</sup> D. *Gr.* 190 f. Compare WRIGHT, *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* 67 f.

<sup>43</sup> Onk. Gen 1 10 14 1 39 20 Deut 30 15 19 etc.

<sup>44</sup> E. g. Ber 16b<sub>6</sub> Yoma 71a<sub>9</sub>.

Spanish (ed. Livorno 1791) texts is more idiomatic.<sup>45</sup> According to the Talmud Ber 35b<sub>14</sub> all food stuffs are called מִזֶּן. Further on (Ber 44a<sup>14</sup>) מִזֶּנָּה is defined as satisfying food, a meal in contrast with זֶנָּה food, anything eatable. The form מִזֶּן in Biblical Aramaic is a Hebraism for מִזֶּנָּה.

רִוּחָא unpunctuated רווחא may have arisen out of the adj. רוּחָא. רוּחָא in some MSS.<sup>46</sup> pointed רִוּחָא. D., *Gr.* 105 140.

יָקוּם פֿורקן in the German version by יִפְרָקְנָא.

מְרִי שְׁמִיָּא וְאַרְעָא This designation,<sup>47</sup> an expansion of the Biblical מְרָא,<sup>48</sup> approximately the same as the very frequent מְרָא עלמא,<sup>49</sup> appears to be original here. The reading מִמְרָא דְשְׁמִיָּא וְאַרְעָא is based on the not infrequent Targumic designation מִמְרָא דְשְׁמִיָּא.<sup>50</sup>

The construct מְרָא in Biblical Aramaic is in later orthography generally מְרִי Sing. and Plur. But in accordance with the scrupulous care exercised to exclude rigidly every suspicion of plurality as applied to God,<sup>51</sup> the choice here lay between מְרִיָּה and מְרָא. מְרִי even as a Plural would be defensible as equivalent to בעלִים, אֲדָנִים, but such ambiguous forms were carefully avoided.

מִן-קֶדָם already in Dan 2 18 5 24 etc., as in מִלְפָּנָיו of Esth 4 8 etc.—compare Acts 3 19,—used very frequently in the Targum, is the only one of the expressions characteristic of the Targum's avoidance of anthropomorphism and anthropopathism that is met with regularly in Jewish Aramaic outside the Targum. See p. 68.

<sup>45</sup> מִזֶּן in Biblical Hebrew is used only as a collective singular. The plural מִזֶּנוֹת in Rabbinical Hebrew is common for (various) foods.

<sup>46</sup> E. g. Or. 2389 GASTER 321.

<sup>47</sup> Compare Ps 89 12 115 15 121 2 Ezra 5 11 Gen 14 19 Acts 17 24 Pesh. מִן-קֶדָם.

<sup>48</sup> Dan 5 23 Eccl. Rab. to 3 2 p. 9 c.

<sup>49</sup> Targum to Cant. 19 times (GRÜNBAUM, *ZDMG.* XXXIX 1885 p. 571). J I Gen 9 6 22 1 49 20 27 Exod 12 11 Deut 28 12 34 6 J I Eccl 5 11. Palmyrene DE VOGÜÉ 73 Judith 9 12.

<sup>50</sup> Targ. Eccl 4 11 3 Amram I 52b.

<sup>51</sup> ZUNZ, *Ritus* 39 (the variation between קוּיָּהּ and קוּנָּה) may be explained in the same way.

תְּהִלָּי חֲרָבָא וְכַפְנָא וּמוֹתָנָא וּמְרַעִין בִּישׁוֹן [יַעֲרִי] <sup>1</sup> מִנְגָּא [וּמִנְכּוֹן] (וְכַל)  
 Abudarham ( ). Modern Spanish [ ].  
 The Tur Yore Deah 376 reads וּמוֹתָנָא מִנְגָּא וּמְכַל  
 עֲמִיָּה בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאִמְרוּ אִמֵּן.

יְהִי לִמְנָא וּמִנְכּוֹן וּמִן אֲנִפְנָא וּמִן אֲנִפִּיכּוֹן וּמִכָּל אֲפִיָּא דְכָל בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל חֲטָאָה  
 חֲרָבָא שְׂבִיָּא בְּפָנָא מוֹתָא מוֹתָנָא גְלוּתָא מְעִיקָא מִחַת יָדָא דְסָנְאָה וּבְעַל דְּבָבָא  
 וְיִתִּיב קֹדֶשׁא בְּרִידָה הוּא תְּקוּף רוּגְזָה מִנְגָּא וּמִנְכּוֹן וּמִן אֲנִפִּיכּוֹן וּמִכָּל-  
 לַחֲיִים also ending with אִמֵּן, אֲפִיָּא דְכָל-בֵּית-יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעִגְלָא וּבְזִמְן קָרִיב אִמְרוּ אִמֵּן  
 ולשלום. Yemen MS. GASTER 243.

The paragraph is known to Hai Gaon (939—1038) and from him to Isaac Giat (1038—1089) and Nachmanides (1194—1270). It figures too in the burial Kaddish of the Carpentras rite.<sup>2</sup>

A Persian view of the growing depravity of the world often found a place in Jewish eschatology, and supported from the Bible,<sup>3</sup> the Messianic times were pictured as being ushered in by a period of misfortunes and direst distress—הַמְּשִׁיחַ (חֲבִלִּיו שֶׁל) <sup>4</sup> Therefore the cessation of woes is among the ten characteristic signs of the glorious future (לְעֵתִיד לְבוֹא) <sup>5</sup> when the desolate cities shall be rebuilt,<sup>6</sup> peace shall reign,<sup>7</sup> and weeping<sup>8</sup> and death<sup>9</sup> shall cease. This finds expression for instance in the Sibylline Oracles III (753) "Neither war (חֲרָבָא) nor drought shall be on earth any more, (754) nor hunger (כַּפְנָא) and the fruits of the destructive hail, (755) but great peace on the whole earth." So behind the surface thought of the removal of the temporal calamities and woes of persecution, is the Messianic prayer that the sword may give way to the promised peace among men and beast, that famine and hunger (כַּפְנָא) may be turned to plenty and contentment, and that pestilence (מוֹתָנָא) and evil diseases (וּמְרַעִין בִּישׁוֹן)

<sup>1</sup> Compare Targ. Isa 25 8.

<sup>2</sup> LANDSHUTH, בקור חולים p. LXI. MÜLLER

מפתח p. 209.

<sup>3</sup> Joel 21 et seq. Zach 14 6 et seq. Dan 12 1.

<sup>4</sup> Mal 3 2 Dan 12 1 Matth 24 6—9 Sota 9 15 Sanh 97a 98a 98b <sup>11</sup>. Derech Eres Zutṭa 10 beginning Jubilees 23 12 Sibyllines 3 796 Cant. Rab. to 2 13 p. 17 c. d. JELLINEK, BH. II 58 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Exod. Rab. to 12 2 15. SCHÜRER, GJV. II 631.

<sup>6</sup> Ezek 16 55.

<sup>7</sup> Isa 24 9 6 Hos 2 20 Mic 4 3 Zach 9 10 Targ. Isa 11 6 Shab 6 4.

<sup>8</sup> Isa 65 19 25 8.

<sup>9</sup> Isa 25 8.



may no longer afflict mankind. According to Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba (3rd cent.),<sup>10</sup> a desolating pestilence (מוֹתָנָא) will precede the approach of the Messiah. According to R. Yohanan in the second, third and fourth "weeks" preceding the Messianic advent there will be famine (כַּפְנָא) in varying degrees, and in the seventh "week" wars (חֲרָבָא) with Gog and Magog.

The parallel strophe in יהי רצון<sup>11</sup> (the second) runs יהי רצון מלפני [אלהי] השמים לרחם על פליטנו [ולחמול על שאריתנו] ולעצור (את) המגפה ו(את) המשתת [והדבר והרעב והשבי והביזה וגוירות קשות לבטל] מעלינו ומעל [כל] (עמו) ישראל ואמרו אמן יעדי of the modern Spanish version. A similar prayer is given in Keth 8b<sup>11</sup>.

תתְּפִלִּי feminine agreeing with חֲרָבָא. כֹּלָא is used technically of withholding rain<sup>12</sup> or the plague.<sup>13</sup>

חֲרָבָא וְרַעֲבָא וּמוֹתָנָא the juxtaposition (חֲרָב וְרַעֲב וְדָבָר) is a favourite one in Jeremiah, occurring 12 times in that order<sup>14</sup> and twice in a varying order,<sup>15</sup> in Ezekiel 3 times<sup>16</sup> and 5 times in a varying order.<sup>17</sup> The punishments offered to David were רַעֲב, חֲרָב, דָּבָר.<sup>18</sup> Solomon prays for help if these three afflictions should befall the people 1 K 8 33 the sword, 8 35 famine, 8 37 pestilence (= 2 Chr 6 24 26 28), and Jehoshaphat quotes this in his prayer חֲרָב שָׁמוֹם וְדָבָר וְרַעֲב (2 Chr 20 9). In Jeremiah the phrase is invariably simple. In Ezekiel it is sometimes inflated with other words such as חֵיהָ רַעֲבָא (5 17 14 21). But it is usually expanded in a way that shows with startling clearness *the beginnings of the tradition of Midrashic interpretation by further qualification or specialised application of the words of*

<sup>10</sup> Cant. Rabba to 2 13 p. 17c Sanh 97a top.

<sup>11</sup> Amram I 24a ( ), 33a [ ]. GASTER 113 BAER 124 Roman 23b. See p. 80 note 7 p. 92 note 8.

<sup>12</sup> Targ. Gen 8 2 1 Kings 8 35. ZDMG. XLI 1887 605 Note 4 BARTH, and BARTH, ES. 70.

<sup>13</sup> Num 17 13 15 25 8 O. JI 2 Sam 24 21 25 1 Chr 21 22 Ps 106 30 Assy. kalû to withhold, shut off, hold back.

<sup>14</sup> Jer 14 12 21 9 38 2 24 10 27 8 29 17 f. 32 24 36 42 17 22 44 13.

<sup>15</sup> Jer 21 7 34 17.

<sup>16</sup> Ezek 6 11 7 15 b 12 16.

<sup>17</sup> Ezek 5 12 17 6 12 7 15 a 14 21.

<sup>18</sup> 1 Chr 21 12 (= 2 Sam 24 13). Cf. Amos 4 10.



to the Talmud<sup>24</sup> far more grievous than בצורתא. It must be translated famine. Famine may be of three degrees (1) של בצורת,<sup>25</sup> (2) של מהומה,<sup>26</sup> (3) של כליה.<sup>27</sup>

מותנא is in the Targum seldom the equivalent of דבר<sup>28</sup> for which מותא more regularly occurs, while מותנא stands for מנפה, נגף etc.<sup>29</sup> But both words are used synonymously. מותא in 2 Sam 24 13 and 1 Kgs 8 37 is in the parallel passages 1 Chr 21 12 2 Chr 6 28 מותנא. On דבר J. Yebam 8 3 9c<sup>13</sup>.

חלים רעים and באיש, ביש the usual equivalent of ימרעין בישין are both used for the adjective "ill, sick."<sup>31</sup>

יערי Afel, not as ed. Sabionetta, followed by JASTROW, Pael, as the Biblical usage shows.<sup>32</sup> The more usual pointing in the superlinear system is with closed syllable יערי but forms like יערי also occur.<sup>33</sup>

## APPENDIX A.

### *The Name קריש* (p. 10).

There is little evidence to show why this prayer should be called קריש 'holy', as Massecheth Soferim names it,<sup>1</sup> or the emphatic form קרישא.<sup>2</sup> The adjective here has clearly taken on substantival significance "the holy prayer or praise" but the contents of the paragraphs hardly seem to merit this designation. The holy praise, the

<sup>24</sup> Ta'an 19ab מדינתא אמדינתא כפנא בצורתא. (See Rashi and Tosafoth). Or again ושכיחא בצורתא. ארבעה ולא שכיחא כפנא.  
<sup>25</sup> 1 Kgs 18 2. <sup>26</sup> 2 Kgs 6 24—29.

<sup>27</sup> Aboth 5 8 cf. Gen Rab 40 beginning, to Gen 12 10.

<sup>28</sup> Lev 26 25 1 Chr 21 12 14 2 Chr 6 28 20 9 Ps 78 50 according to many MSS.

<sup>29</sup> Num 14 37 17 13—15 25 8 9 18 f.

<sup>30</sup> Deut 28 59 J I Exod 23 25 O. Eccl 6 2.

<sup>31</sup> Gen 35 9 J II J. Beša 16 60c<sub>9</sub> Ber 22a<sub>1</sub> Shab 30a<sup>10</sup>, J I Gen 48 1 Exod 18 20 Deut 34 6 Ezek 34 4.

<sup>32</sup> Dan 2 21 5 20 7 12 26. Cf. SAYCE-COWLEY, *Egypt. Aram. G.* 35.

<sup>33</sup> D. Gr. 345 267 51.

<sup>1</sup> Soferim 16 12 19 1 12 21 6.

<sup>2</sup> Orhōth Hayyim קרישא דרבנן. Buxtorf in his Lexicon p. 598b, perhaps misled by the less common form קרישא, translates המסכתא קרישא "sanctus discipulus Rabbīnorum absoluto tractatu dicebit" . . .



prayer dealing with holiness par excellence, would be an inept designation in view of the use of the Trisagion in the liturgy. This threefold "holy" and the recitation of verses dealing with קדש is called קדושה (קדושה). The sanctification of the Sabbath, festivals etc. is called קדושה (קדושה, קדושה) and both these are naturally named. The second word of the prayer ויתקדש (Ezek 36 23 וקדשתי את שמי and Targ.), certainly not the leitmotiv of the prayer, can hardly be thought to have occasioned its name. It may be that the importance attached to the prayer (Appendix B) earned for it the title קדוש. But in view of the original function of the prayer, it is perhaps more probable that this name is given it for its relatively high degree of holiness as compared with the preceding words of instruction, as being the prayer concluding the discursive teaching of the Aggada, the sacred seal of exalted prayer and praise to the homiletic discourse. Hence also the name קדוש is in Aramaic, since the prayer itself is the Aramaic conclusion to an Aramaic address held in the lecture room where the language in use was Aramaic.

## APPENDIX B.

*The Kaddish as a mourner's prayer and prayer for the dead* (p. 10).

The history of the application of the Kaddish as a mourner's prayer and as a prayer for the dead is by no means clear.<sup>1</sup> Two main tendencies seem to have worked towards it. In the passages A B C D F (Page 8f.) great importance is attached to the (response to the) Kaddish. It is plain that the (response to the) prayer is valued so highly, chiefly in so far as it implies the presence of the people in the synagogue and lecture room, the two pillars that supported Judaism after the destruction of the state, and the consequent praise of God's Name from the mouth of the assembled congregation. In these passages, and in passages like the Targ. to Jud 5 9 (2) לא פסקו מלמדרש באוריתא וכדו יאי להון דיתבין בבתי כנישתא and TBER 2 11 בריש גלי ומלפין ית עמא פתגמא אוריתא ומברכין ומודין קדם ה'

<sup>1</sup> DALMAN, *Saat auf Hoffnung* XXVII 1890 p. 169ff. touches upon some points in connection with the mourning Kaddish. Also OBERMEYER *Modernes Judentum im Morgen- und Abendland*, Vienna 1907 pp. 91—143.





נאמרה בו שכיבה. יואב שלא הניח בן כמותו נאמרה בו מיתה (1 Kgs 11 21) "Of David who left a son worthy of himself it is said that he slept; of Joab who had no son who inherited his greatness it is said that he died" (1 K 11 21). The verse Isa 29 22 בית יעקב אשר פדה את אברהם was interpreted of Jacob's having redeemed Abraham.<sup>4</sup> According to the same school the dead require an atonement,<sup>5</sup> and none could effect this better than the son or grandson—ברא מוכי אבא (Sanh 104a 28) "the son vindicates the father." The son when repeating a teaching of his father within twelve months of the father's death should not say 'Thus said my father', but 'Thus said my honored father, (may I be an expiation for him)' לא יאמר .<sup>6</sup> As we see in the Akiba legend, where ברכו is equivalent to reading the prayers, the son best confers saving merit on the father by taking some part in the synagogue service in which he is the mouthpiece of the congregation, so that all may see that he is following in his father's footsteps. So too in TBER. 18 99 when the son of the dead man reads the law in the synagogue or participates actively in the discussions of the study house, the people bless Thy great Name through him על ידיו לשמן הגדול (i. e. 'ונמצאו הרבים מברכים לשמן הגדול על ידיו' (יהא שמיה רב' מב' עם הארץ' Isa 29 22 based on TBEZ. 12 194) or "an unlearned man is rescued from the punishment of Gehinnom by his son who has studied the Torah."

Thus summing up, we see *on the one hand the utmost importance attributed to the Kaddish, and its recital attended with the most far reaching results, according to the tradition of the mystics; and on the other hand, we have the idea fully worked out of the redeeming power for the parent of the orphan's recital of prayers to which there were congregational responses.* These two streams of thought naturally met, resulting in the custom of the orphan's saying Kaddish or

<sup>4</sup> Gen. Rab 63 to תולדות beginning, to Gen 25 19, TBEZ. 12 194.

<sup>5</sup> Sifre 210 to Deut 21 8 end of שופטים p. 112b Pesikta Rabbathi 95b שמא תאמר כיון שירד לניהנם אין לו תעלה כיון שמבקשים עליו רחמים וזרק אותו מניהנם כחץ מן הקשת Cf. J. Sanh 10 5 29c 25.

<sup>6</sup> Kidd 31b <sup>10</sup> Compare Succ 20a 7 Neg 21 Sanh 21 T. Sanh 41 420 12.

<sup>7</sup> Compare TBER. 17 87 f.



ברכו, the essence of both of these being their similar responses. According to the Mahzor Vitry, as in the Akiba legend, the orphan says ברכו או קדיש at the close of the Sabbath when the souls return to Gehinnom. Now the *locus classicus* for the power of the son to redeem the father is Isa 29 22f. לכן כה אמר ה' אל בית יעקב אשר פדה את אברהם לא עתה יבוש יעקב ולא עתה פניו יחנור: כי בראתו ילדיו מעשה Jacob shall no more be ashamed (Dan 12 2) when he sees his children sanctifying the Name of his God," and from this emphasis on the sanctification (קדיש), the Kaddish has displaced ברכו in this application and remained the mourner's prayer par excellence.

Although S. REINACH<sup>8</sup> traces the origin of prayers for the dead among the Jews in Egypt<sup>9</sup> etc. to Alexandrian teachings and in Greece, Asia Minor and Italy to Orphic influence, ISRAEL LÉVI<sup>10</sup> finds no certain traces of them before Gaonic times. The Kaddish is in its contents anything but a prayer for the dead: השכבה, גיחות נפשא, אשרבתא,<sup>11</sup> and in its original application to mourning it was also not a prayer for the dead in the true sense of the term. But in popular practice it became one. Hence we find many protests against this use of it. In 107 Hai Gaon is quoted as protesting against such intercession.<sup>12</sup> R. Abraham b. Hiyya ha-Nasi (d. c. 1136 Barcelona) wrote in הגיון הנפש<sup>13</sup>: כל החושב על מעשה בניו אבני עמו שהם עושים בגללו אחרי מותו ומתפללים בעדו שהם מועילים לו, מחשבות "They buoy themselves up with vain hopes who reckon on the actions and prayers of their sons benefiting them after death. This too is the opinion of all good authorities." ABRAHAM HURWITZ (16th century) in יש האב יצוה לבניו להחזיק באיזה מצוה נוחלין p. 35 Intro. wrote similarly ואם מקיימין אותו נחשב יותר מן הקדיש. ואם כך אפילו יש לו בת יש לו תקנה זו. דקדיש זה אינו תפלה שיתפלל הבן על האב לפני ה' שיעללו משאול אלא זכות ומצוה הוא למת כשבנו מקדש השם יתברך ברכים והקהל יענה

<sup>8</sup> RÉJ. XLI 1900 161 et seq.

<sup>9</sup> 2 Macc 12 43 from which the masses for the dead grew up in the Church. A. L. GREEN and W. H. LOWE *Jewish Chronicle* 1880 May 21<sup>st</sup>. to July 30<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> RÉJ. XXIX 1894 48 et seq.

<sup>11</sup> ZUNZ, *Nachtrag to Literatur-Geschichte* 1.

<sup>12</sup> See Bahye b. Asher to Deut 21 8; compare WARNHEIM קבוצת חכמים.

<sup>13</sup> Ed. FREIMANN, Leipzig 1860 p. 32. RAPOPORT's Preface to it p. 58.

אחריו אמן יהא שמה רבא מברך. "Let the son keep a particular precept given him by his father, and it shall be of greater worth than the recital of the Kaddish. The same is true also of daughters. For the Kaddish is not a prayer of the son that the father may be brought up from Sheol, but a recognition of the parent's merit, since through its recital the child best vindicates the memory of his parent by causing the congregation to respond to him with the praise *אשר*." But the principle of Soferim 13 10 that in praises springing from the heart the ruling shall give way to custom, *בשבה* ותהלה של חי העולמים שהדבר תלוי בלב לשנות הלכה למעשה here also. The custom is in modern times explained as illustrating the principle that one should praise God equally for the good and for the evil that befalls one *על הרעה כשם שמברך על* חייב אדם לברך על הרעה כשם שמברך על. <sup>14</sup> By reading nothing into the words that is not contained in them, we get in "the healthy, cheerful manliness of the mourner's Kaddish"<sup>15</sup> the beautiful custom of the praise of God in the hour of deepest mourning. But it was not always understood as such. It was at first said during the first year of mourning,<sup>16</sup> *אין המת* אין המת (Ber 58b<sub>27</sub>). "The memory of the dead begins to grow dim in the heart when twelve months have passed round." These twelve months, perhaps in origin due to Persian teaching, also corresponded with the longest period of suffering in Gehinnom;<sup>17</sup> and as the Kaddish was popularly regarded as a prayer of intercession for the departed souls, its recital during the 12 months of mourning was later curtailed to the first eleven months so as not to cast an unworthy reflection on the parent.<sup>18</sup> R. Nissim in his *מגלת סתרים*<sup>19</sup> is careful to point out that the power of the Kaddish is limited to lightening the punishment of the departed. So too Eleazar of Worms (c. 1176—1238) cautiously

<sup>14</sup> Ber 60b<sub>5</sub> Job 1 21 Akiba's saying כל דעביר רחמנא למב.

<sup>15</sup> G. E. BIDDLE, *JQR.* XIX 1907 220.

<sup>16</sup> Kol Bo הלכות אבל ed. Venice p. 133a, first mentioned for an orphan in אור l. c.

<sup>17</sup> Eduy 2 10 RH. 17a<sup>10</sup> T. Sanh 13 4 434 17f. Shab 83b<sub>16</sub> 152b<sub>2</sub> Semach 14.

<sup>18</sup> Shulhan Aruch, Yore Deah 374 4 Isserles.

<sup>19</sup> Quoted in the ספר חסידים ed. WISTINETZKI § 605 (= 32 of the editions) p. 29. Paḥad Yiṣṣaḥ.



expresses himself<sup>20</sup> **כי החי יכול לבקש להקל דין המת**. "The living may seek to lighten the punishment of the dead by prayer".

The use of the mourning Kaddish was in the course of time extended also to the anniversary of the parent's death, the "Jahrzeit" among the German Jews, although this application of it, first found in Maharil, remained strange to the Jews of Spain and the Orient, until it was adopted through a cabbalistic explanation given it by Isaac Luria of Safed.<sup>21</sup> The origin of the custom is perhaps to be sought in the persecutions and massacres aroused by the fanaticism of the Crusaders when thousands of Jews met a martyr's death and whole communities, especially along the Rhine, were wiped out. The custom then grew up<sup>22</sup> of holding memorial services for the martyred, for which special prayers **יזכור**, **אב הרחמים** etc. were composed. From a communal mourning service, the individual naturally passes to an individual one.

In later times the application of this Kaddish was extended by allowing grandchildren to say it for their grandparents, parents for children, pupils for teachers, and for relatives and friends and even for complete strangers.<sup>23</sup> Permission too has been given for daughters to say it where there were no sons,<sup>24</sup> and also to say it on the Sabbath, where, as a prayer for the dead, it should be superfluous, as even Gehinnom rests on the Sabbath.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Rokeach 217.

<sup>21</sup> **מקורי** p. 32. **VITAL** *Peri Eš Hayyim* ed. Lemberg 1864 p. 13b. **מקורי** **מנהגים** **אבר. LEWYSOHN** § 98. Compare **MANASSEH B. ISRAEL** 2 27; **ספר חסידים** ed. **WISTINETZKI** § 356 (= 241 of the editions).

<sup>22</sup> **ZUNZ**, *Zur Geschichte* 319. *Nachtrag zur Literaturgeschichte* 4.

<sup>23</sup> Caro, additional note to *Tur Yore Deah* 403, *Shulhan Aruch Yore Deah* 3764, *Orah Hayyim* 132 2 Isserles in the name of earlier authorities, *Pahad Yishak*. See too *Ber* 12b <sup>14</sup> **TBER.** 3 15 = *Yalkut* II 593 to *Malachi* 3 21 for the intercession of the righteous. **MAHARIL** *Responsum* 64.

<sup>24</sup> **ABRAHAM HORWITZ** quoted p. 104. Against the permission, Isserles *Shulhan Aruch Yore Deah* 402 12. *Hayyim Yair Bacharach* (1639—1702) *Responsum* 222 in *Havvoth Yair* (ed. Frankfurt am Main 1699 p. 208).

<sup>25</sup> Isaac of Corbeil 1270 quoted by Isserles *Shulhan Aruch Yore Deah* 376 4. Cf. *Shib. ha Lekeṭ* *Shab.* 81.



## APPENDIX C.

*The Kaddish in the Synagogue Service* (p. 10).

In the time of Massecheth Soferim<sup>1</sup> the synagogue service apparently began with the summons ברכו את ה' המבורך and the Kaddish; and the Kaddish closed the reading of the Law<sup>2</sup> and the whole service. Its function was similar in the time of Maimonides<sup>3</sup> and of Rashi,<sup>4</sup> and although disguised by additions to the liturgy, the same holds good in general of the modern application of it. The rule that praise must always precede the recitation of the Kaddish לעולם אין אומרים קדיש בלא תהלה שלפניו preserves a correct tradition.

The shortest form of the Kaddish, the half Kaddish—הצי קדיש, consisting of the first two paragraphs up to דאמירן בעלמא, forms part of every Kaddish and is sometimes said alone after a part of a service. This together with תתקבל, קדיש בתרא, קדיש גמור, קדיש שלם, קדיש עושה שלום and יהא שלמא, especially the תפלה par excellence, the Shemone 'Esre. Maimonides gives the rule: כל קדיש שאומר שליח צבור אחר שגומר התפלה שאינו אומר אחריו כלום אלא כל העם שומעין אותו ומפטירין נהגו העם להסיף בסופן נסחה זו תתקבל. . . . The Cingalese-Cochin rite for the festival of the Rejoicing of the Law has an elaborated version of it (p. 22a—23b). Following on the paragraph ייתן (3) and תשתלה אמותא (2) (See p. 108) תתבני קרתא (1) are (See p. 13 note 12), (4) תענו a working up of the theme of תכתבו כלכם בספר חיים ותראו בשמחת ירושלם ותשמחו בבנין (5), תתקבל (6) a rhymed יהי רצון about Jerusalem and the Messiah ending ואמרו אמן (p. 70), (7) אב הרהמן beginning (8), עושה שלום במרומיו הוא ברחמי יעשה שלום על כל ישראל . . . (10), דכירין (11), עושה שלום (p. 75), (12) טוב (p. 16).

With the omission of the paragraph תתקבל we get the mourner's Kaddish, קדיש אצל, קדיש יתום. Massecheth Soferim 19 1 p. 262 omits the whole of the Kaddish from the morning service of the

<sup>1</sup> Soferim 10 8 16 12 19 1 21 6.

<sup>2</sup> According to Responsum 321 of Isaac b. Shesheth (1326—1408), sometimes after each reading when there was more than one.

<sup>3</sup> Hilchoth Tefilla 9 and קדיש נוסח.

<sup>4</sup> Rashi Pardes.

fast of the 9th of Ab. A more general custom of the same sort is to omit תתקבל as a sign of the deepest mourning, in connection with Lam. 3 8,<sup>5</sup> sometimes also יהא שלמא.<sup>6</sup>

לחרתא, ליתברך, יהא שלמא, תתכלי, and עושה שלום make up the burial Kaddish, used also in the Spanish rite on the fast of the 9th Ab.

לחרתא, ליתברך, יהא שלמא, and עושה שלום form the study house Kaddish in the Orient, while the half Kaddish, על ישראל etc. constitute that of the Occident.<sup>7</sup> In the burial Kaddish of the Yemen rite after דאמין בעלמא וא' אמן the following paragraph, practically identical with (1) of the Cochin Kaddish (p. 107),<sup>8</sup> is inserted: תתבני קרתא דירושלם ויתוב פולחנא דשמיא לאתריה [בהרריה בווייה וביקריה בחיינא ו] בחייכון (וביומיכון) ובחיי דכל בית ישראל בעגלא ובזמן קריב ויאמרו אמן. This is followed by a paragraph beginning יתכלי (p. 97).

The special form of the Kaddish found in some German rituals for the commemoration service<sup>9</sup> is quite modern, as is also its Hebrew form in some modern service books. The קדיש דיחיד is a mystical meditation for the individual while the Kaddish is recited by the officiant. Four examples are given in Amram,<sup>10</sup> but they are not found in later manuals.

The Kaddish closing each part of a service is repeated in one form or other many times throughout the day. שבע ביום הללתיך (Ps 119 164) is specially applied to the Kaddish by the Geonim. On the other hand its too frequent repetition has not infrequently been attacked.<sup>11</sup>

According to the old ruling of the Talmud<sup>12</sup> based on Lev 22 32 "words of holiness and sanctification need a religious quorum of ten males for their recitation." Therefore the Kaddish, "the holy prayer," in origin too a congregational prayer, always requires the presence of a quorum of ten

<sup>5</sup> Mordecai to Ta'an 635.

<sup>6</sup> Abudarham.

<sup>7</sup> Shibbole ha Lekēṭ 8.

<sup>8</sup> Yemen MS. GASTER 243 [ ], Cochin ( ).

<sup>9</sup> Beginning על ישראל ועל צדיקא ועל כל מן דאתפטר מן עלמא הרין. It is the old Hashcaba formula (p. 16) put into the form of a paragraph of the Kaddish.

<sup>10</sup> Amrām I 8b 12b 13b 14b in one MS only.

<sup>11</sup> SAMUEL ABOAB דבר שמואל No. 183. ZUNZ, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*<sup>2</sup> 494 note d. Ḥayye Abraham of Abraham Piperno § 70. Keneseth Hagedolah to Tur Orach Ḥayyim 553.

<sup>12</sup> Ber 21b <sup>15</sup> Meg 23b <sup>18</sup>.







Responses are inserted at various points in the prayer, mostly at syntactically inappropriate places. The **אמן** after the fourth word **רבה** breaks up the sentence, but has the support of authority from Amram downwards and of universal custom. Some (e. g. the Spanish Jews) insert an **אמן** between **משיחה** and **בתיכון**, and in the burial Kaddish between **ויקריה** and **בתיכון**. Others<sup>18</sup> require an **אמן** after **ויתברך** and others again<sup>19</sup> one after **ברוך הוא**. To both, the Tur notes that modern custom does not recognise them, while to the latter, Amram himself remarks that although supposed to be said, it is usually not said. The present custom differs, the Germans responding **קודשא בריך הוא** to **קודשא**, the Spanish Jews **אמן** to **ברוך הוא**. All these responses mar the unity of the sentence in which they are given. On **חיים** see p. 73.

**אמן** in modern times closes each paragraph, it being introduced by **ואמרו**. The paragraph **תתקבל** according to the Minhag of Maimonides and Yemen<sup>20</sup> is not sealed with **אמן ואמרו** as it itself is a response of the congregation. In **עושה שלום** many texts<sup>21</sup> omit **אמן ואמרו**; modern rites insert it. The practice of interjecting Biblical verses during the recitation of a prayer is discountenanced by the Talmud.<sup>22</sup> Nevertheless the Minhag is old of responding at **יתגדל** with Num 14 17<sup>23</sup> and Ps 25 6,<sup>24</sup> the former owing probably to the connecting link of the word **כה** of special importance to the Cabbalists such as Luria (cf. Shab. 119b<sup>25</sup>).<sup>26</sup> At **תתקבל** the congregation commonly interjects **את תפלתנו וברצון את תפלתנו** words occurring in the 16th paragraph of the Shemone 'Esre. The custom is later of interjecting Ps 113 2 at **יהא שלמה** and Ps 121 2 at **עושה שלום**. The practice of inserting these verses and the inappropriate **Amens** is largely the result of congregational impatience. In the Mozarabic

<sup>18</sup> Amram, Maimonides, Tur and Shulhan Aruch Orah Hayyim 56.

<sup>19</sup> Amram, Seadya, Maimonides, Chinese. <sup>20</sup> Yemen Or. 2418 adds **אמן ואמרו**.

<sup>21</sup> Amram, Maimonides, some Genizah fragments, old Carpentras, Lille, Old Italian, Yemen Or. 1479, GASTER 321 etc.

<sup>22</sup> Sota 40a top Shulhan Aruch Orah Hayyim 128 26.

<sup>23</sup> Tur Orah Hayyim 56, Isserles to Shulhan Aruch ibid. quoting Mordecai to Berachoth.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. Said by Nahmanides **שערי תשובה** to Shulhan Aruch ibid. note 5.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. VITAL *Peri Es Hayyim* **שער הקדישים**, *Matteh Moshe* § 71, 73.

<sup>26</sup> Compare Isa 49 8 Ps 19 15 69 14 Targum to Cant 1 16 etc.

liturgy of the Church, the Paternoster was "broken up with *Amens* and other responses, a peculiarity which bespeaks extreme antiquity."<sup>26</sup> Perhaps too, the desire to add some response after the mention of God's Name influenced the insertion of the inappropriate *אמן* after *יהא שלמא רבא מן חיים* and *קדשא בריך הוא* and *שמיה רבא* *שמיה*.

## APPENDIX D.

### *The Kaddish and the Paternoster* (p. 21).

Matthew 6

9b Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

[אבוהון דבשמיא]

9c ἀγiasθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου

יתקדש שמיה רבא

10a ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου

ימלך מלכותיה (בחייכון)

10bc γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν

כרעותיה בעלמא

οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

Compare Luke 11 2b.

These verses 9b—10 form the first half of the prayer. The corresponding members (ver. 11—13) that form the second half of the prayer can have no relationship to the Kaddish as they are personal requests dealing with (11) food, (12) debts and (13) temptation. HARNACK<sup>1</sup> regards ver. 9b—10 as directly borrowed from the traditional Jewish prayers at a very early date, thus, though doubting their authenticity in the mouth of Jesus, giving us for the purpose of comparison just the same age for the Kaddish-like original as does the traditional view that regards them as an original part of the prayer. (See p. 22.) The similarity between the two prayers is much greater than might appear at first sight. For although the expressions are so simple, it is the coincidence in order that is of weight. It must be remembered also that the original of the Paternoster was in Aramaic, both Greek versions using a common source. (Compare the rare word ἐπιούσιος). Furthermore the fact of the Kaddish being in the 3rd person debars any

<sup>26</sup> J. E. FIELD, *The Apostolic Liturgy* p. 469.

<sup>1</sup> See page 22, note 58 etc.

opening address corresponding with 9b. This address, although the corresponding term *אֲבוּהוֹן דְּבִשְׁמַיָּא* occurs in a later portion of the prayer, needs no attesting, as "Jesus took this designation of God from the popular usage of his time."<sup>2</sup>

G. KLEIN<sup>3</sup> has shown the complete conformity of the Paternoster with Jewish norms of prayer. He traces the whole of it back to Ezek 36 especially ver. 23—31, just as we see that the Kaddish goes back to the Messianic chapter of Gog and Magog Ezek 38 especially verse 23. Verses 9c and 10a have their exact equivalent in the Kaddish except for the difference of person. 10bc is best construed as generally supplementing 9c 10a in thought, as *כְּרַעוּתִיה* and *בַּעֲלָמָא* must be construed with *יִתְקַדֵּשׁ שְׁמִיה* and *יִמְלִיךָ מַלְכוּתִיה* (p. 28, 33). *בַּעֲלָמָא* understood in its expanded form (p. 32) *הַבָּא הַזֶּה וְהָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה* gives a closer parallel to 10c.

Hence, although both the Greek and Aramaic versions very naturally contain slight elements peculiar to themselves, the agreement between them is so close and so exact in main features and in almost all details, that their essential unity of origin is undeniable.<sup>4</sup>

## APPENDIX E.

### *Antiphonal recitation (p. 45).*

Doubling of whole verses is found elsewhere especially in the *שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת* Psalms, e. g. Ps 121 1—2, 3—4, 5—6, 7—8, Ps 122 1, 2—3, 4—5, 6—7, 8—9. Ps 129 1 (the summons), 2—3, 4—5, 6—7, 8 etc. Verse by verse recitation of Ps 134 by two Levite choirs (without doubled verses) is described in T. Succ 4 7, 199 1 *מָה הוּא אוֹמֵר הֵנָּה בָּרְכוּ אֵת*

<sup>2</sup> D. WJ. 154 "*Jesus hat diese Bezeichnung Gottes dem Volksgebrauche seiner Zeit entnommen*".

<sup>3</sup> *Zeitschrift f. d. neutestamentliche Wissenschaft u. d. Kunde des Urchristentums* VII 1906.

<sup>4</sup> The wild efforts of ERICH BISCHOFF (*Jesus und die Rabbinen* p. 73 ff.) to discredit every trace of Jewish thought in Jesus' teaching are robbed of every vestige of scientific worth by their blind, polemical partizanship. LIGHTFOOT, SCHEIDT, SCHÖTTGEN, VITRINGA, OTHO, THOLUCK, CH. TAYLOR, WÜNSCHE, DALMAN, HARNACK and very many others in calm, deliberate judgment recognise the Jewish origin of the Paternoster, here shown to hold good in every detail.



ה' כל עבדי ה'. יש מהן אומר שאו ידיכם קודש וברכו את ה'. כשהיו נפטרין ending with Ps 128 5. 6 instead of the expected Ps 134 3. GRAETZ<sup>1</sup> treats Ps 118 19ff. as a dialogue between two choirs, one within the Temple and one without. Ps 24 is clearly dramatic.

The alphabetical Psalm of praise Ps 145 is found in the earliest forms of synagogue and temple services.<sup>2</sup> The ג verse being missing, it has only 21 verses, an old number that would create an awkwardness in alternating recitation. In verse one the leader would give the leitmotiv ועד לעולם שמך לעולם ועד, returning to it in verse 21 with יברך כל בשר שם קדשו לעולם ועד. To this the congregation would have no response. And for this reason apparently the ancient custom of adding in conclusion the apt verse Ps 115 18: ואנחנו נברך יה מעתה ועד עולם: arose. The custom of adding this verse, connected with the Psalm as far back as can be traced, has never been accounted for, but is easily intelligible as necessitated by the scheme of antiphonal recitation.

The response in half verses, the מקרה reading the first half of the verse, the congregation completing it, is still more instructive and seems to be of far reaching importance.

To take an instance from Ps 135—Ps 136 being the same Psalm arranged in the form of a litany—ver. 5a (sing.) looks as if read by the מקרה, 5b (plur.) by the congregation, and ver. 19a—b 20a—b were almost certainly antiphonally recited. Examples like the Song of Moses (Exod 15) או ישיר משה ובני ישראל or the song of Deborah (Jud 5) ותשר דבורה וברק point to a kind of dialogue between two persons, the parallelism in these songs<sup>3</sup> bearing this out entirely.

This method of reciting poetry seems to be at the bottom of

<sup>1</sup> GRAETZ, *MGWJ.* XXVIII 1879 210. In Midr. Sam. 197 p. 52b Samuel ben Nahman assigns different parts of Ps 118 21—24 to David, Jesse, Samuel, David's brothers, and all of them together. See the Targum ib. ver. 23 to end. Cf. BACHER, *MWJ.* 1872 415.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Ber 4b הבה בן עולם הבא לו שמואל בן עולם הבא.

<sup>3</sup> Exod 15 2a—b c—d, 3a—b, 4a—b, 5a—b, 6a—b and so on all through. Similarly in Jud 5, note especially v. 7 שקמתי 2nd sing. fem. (Deborah); Barak sings ויששכר כן ברק 15a—b. See PAUL RUBEN, *JQR.* X 1898 541 et seq.

parallelism, the characteristic of Hebrew poetry. There are two voices heard, one the leader giving the thought, the other (a chorus?) answering, repeating the thought in varying words (*synonymous parallelism*) or developing it (*antithetic and synthetic parallelism*). The phenomenon could not be more striking than in the examples of the above two songs. *This explanation of palillogical parallelism by two voices*—often female voices<sup>4</sup>—is the most natural interpretation of the anadiplosis and epanalepsis that distinguish Hebrew poetry. Seeking the origin of this swinging dithyrambic form in two singers, the absence of rhyme is fully intelligible; and it is readily seen why all attempts to discover an exact metre in Hebrew poetry, have resulted only in making it certain that nothing but the rhythm of parallelism and the consequent stresses dominate Hebrew poesy.<sup>5</sup>

Naturally once primitive poetry had received this recognised form, one singer could take the double part; or the poet in later times could compose for both voices, and knowing his own thought could develop it much more freely in the required form. Hence we cannot hope to find the two voices in much of the comparatively late poetry of the Old Testament. But undoubtedly many fresh points of view could be obtained by applying this principle in very many cases.<sup>6</sup> As an example Ps 115 9—18 might be set out as a joyous dialogue between the priests and the people. The priests call upon the people on some occasion of festive gladness to bless the Lord; the people after apparent wavering, do so. Thus:

כהנים. ישראל בטח בה' — עזרם ומגנם הוא<sup>7</sup>  
קהל. בית אהרן בטחו בה' — עזרם ומגנם הוא

<sup>4</sup> E. g. 1 Sam 18 7 2 Sam 1 20 24 Jud 11 40 Ex 15 20 etc.

<sup>5</sup> All the investigations of BICKELL, SIEVERS etc. have proved nothing more certainly than this.

<sup>6</sup> D. H. MÜLLER, *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form*, also in *Strophenbau und Responsion*; FELIX PERLES, *Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes* 1896 103 etc. PAUL RUBEN, *JQR.* XI 1899 431 et seq. ZENNER, *Die Chorgesänge im B. der Psalmen* 1896. KÖNIG, *Stylistik* 1900 347 ff. have gone to work on similar lines, but mostly on an ambitious scale that necessitates forced emendations of the text, and cutting it about to an almost impossible degree.

<sup>7</sup> בטחו analogous to ברכו Ps 135 19 20.

יְרֵאִי ה' בְּמַתּוֹ בָּה' — עֲזָרָם וּמִנְגֵּם הוּא	כ'
ה' זָכְרָנוּ יִבְרַךְ <sup>8</sup>	ק'
יִבְרַךְ אֶת בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל	כ'
יִבְרַךְ אֶת בֵּית אַהֲרֹן	ק'
יִבְרַךְ יְרֵאִי ה'	כ'
הַקְטָנִים עִם הַגְּדוֹלִים! <sup>9</sup>	ק'
יִסַּף ה' עֲלֵיכֶם <sup>10</sup>	כ'
עֲלֵיכֶם וְעַל בְּנֵיכֶם <sup>11</sup>	ק'
בְּרוּכִים אַתֶּם לַה' עֹשֵׂה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ	כ'
הַשָּׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם לַה' וְהָאָרֶץ נָתַן לִבְנֵי אָדָם <sup>12</sup>	ק'
לֹא הִמְתִּים יִהְיֶה לָהֶם כָּל יוֹרְדֵי דוֹמָה <sup>13</sup>	כ'
וְאִנְחָנוּ נִבְרַךְ יְהוָה מֵעַתָּה וְעַד עוֹלָם. <sup>14</sup>	ק'

This illustration may not be convincing. The connections could be differently caught and interpreted, just as the Song of Songs is open to varying schemes of dialogue division owing to the difficulty of allotting the words to the different conjectural speakers. But the example is sufficient to show that the system is rich in possibilities of interpretation.

## APPENDIX F.

*The so called "Burial Kaddish" (p. 80).*

There can be little doubt that the original function of this Kaddish was exercised in the study house, as the analogies of similar endings show. This was the custom of Maimonides<sup>1</sup> who writes כל עשרה מישראל או יותר שעוסקין בתלמוד תורה שעל פה ואפילו

<sup>8</sup> The Lord who has been mindful of us up to now will bless us.

<sup>9</sup> That would be blessing the unworthy (הַקְטָנִים the people) and the worthy (הַגְּדוֹלִים the priests) together!

<sup>10</sup> Not so, God will (or may God) increase you.

<sup>11</sup> Nay rather *you* and *your* children.

<sup>12</sup> Catching up the reference to heaven and earth.

<sup>13</sup> Playing on the meaning "earth (grave) he has allotted to the sons of men". Nay, those who return to the dust cannot praise God.

<sup>14</sup> So *we* the living will bless ...

<sup>1</sup> This contradicts what is written in the commentary of 'Maimonides' to the additional (8th) chapter of Aboth (end). But this commentary is more correctly attributed to Rashi. See Talmud, edit. Vilna Aboth p. 15.



במדרשות או בהגדות כשהן מסיימין אומר אחד מהן קריש בנוסח זו יתגדל וית' . . . בעל דעתיה . . . 'When ten have been studying the traditional law together, or even the Midrash or Aggada, at the close, one of them says the following Kaddish . . .', and this is for the most part the custom in the Orient today. But the history of this fuller Kaddish is almost a repetition of that of the simple Kaddish. Similar influences that made of the older Kaddish a prayer for the dead (Appendix B), early made of this version a prayer at the graveside. The immediate occasion for this transference may have been the reference to the Resurrection<sup>2</sup> (c). For centuries<sup>3</sup> this version has in the Occident been regarded as the burial Kaddish; and if we may rely on the text of Massecheth Soferim and a suggested interpretation for it, we get an approximate Gaonic date for this transference. In Soferim 19 12<sup>4</sup> it is prescribed that during the additional service on the Sabbath morning, when mourners are present in synagogue, the reader should go from his place to the synagogue door where they stand, to comfort them with the ברכת אב<sup>5</sup> and then he, the reader, says the Kaddish closing the additional service, ואין אומר בעלמא דעתיד לחרתא אלא על התלמוד ועל הדרש, "and he does not say the Kaddish לחרתא to the mourners for it is said only over the study of the law and its homiletic exposition". The text understood in this way is warning against the growing custom of applying this Kaddish לחרתא to mourning occasions. This transference was all the easier because addresses of comfort were delivered in the seven days of deepest mourning,<sup>6</sup> and the Kaddish that closed these became dissociated from the address and associated with the mourning.

However, the text of this passage as known to Nahmanides (1194—1270) ran תלמיד הדרשן "the Kaddish לחרתא is not

<sup>2</sup> The consolation of Jerusalem (d) also, has traditionally always been coupled with that of mourners over the dead Isa 66 13 Amram 1 55 Tur Yore Deah 379. ספר חסידים ed. WISTINETZKI p. 97 § 305 (= editions § 233) says שבירושלם יחיו מתים וזה הטעם אומרים בצידוק הרין (!) לאחיה מתיא.

<sup>3</sup> Shulhan Aruch Yore Deah § 376 4 עכשו is significant.

<sup>4</sup> MÜLLER gives a different interpretation p. 279.

<sup>5</sup> T. Ber 3 23 f. 8 12 et seq. Ber 46 b <sup>6</sup> Keth 8 b <sup>25</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Examples collected by L. DUKES, *Rabbinische Blumenlese* 247—263.

said except over a scholar".<sup>7</sup> But this text is probably corrupted in harmony with the then prevalent custom and it cannot be preferred in the face of the evidence brought from ancient usage (p. 80) and from Maimonides that the Kaddish **לחיות** is an old doxology to the Aggada, especially in view of the fact that Massecheth Soferim does not know of a mourner's Kaddish. On the contrary, in the above quotation it is the reader, not the mourner, who recites the Kaddish.

A second transference has been made in the Spanish rite where this Kaddish<sup>8</sup> has been adopted also for the fast of the 9th of Ab, the emphasis being laid especially on the restoration (d. e. f. g.), the martyrs (c) and the hope for the future (b). In fact the application of this version for that fast is so appropriate that it is usually said to have been composed by the Geonim for that occasion.

<sup>7</sup> In his own time, he adds, it was said over learned and unlearned alike, as in our own day.

<sup>8</sup> Abudarham without the paragraph **יהא שלמא** as also Carpentras. Modern Spanish without **תתקבל**.

## INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Afel 35, 85, 100  
*Alenu* 33, 36, 75, 84  
 Angels 14, 65, 77  
 Aramaic 10—20  
 Aramaic and Hebrew 10, 13—20, 41, 58, 70, 74  
 Aramaic prayers 12  
*Barchu* 51, 102—104  
 Burial Kaddish 32, 79—89, 97—100, 108, 115—117  
 Daniel, Book of 2, 3, 16, 17, 27, 30, 37, 38, 45, 46, 56, 58, 72, 87, 96, 99  
 Dead, Prayers for 16, 101—106, 108, 115—117  
 Doxology, The greater 78  
 Doxology, The Kaddish a 8—10, 49, 50  
 Doxology of the Paternoster 48, 49  
 Doxology of the Psalms 42, 46, 48  
 Essenism 21—23, 57  
 Genizah 17, 18, 26, 52, 59, 69, 76, 81  
 Gloria in Excelsis 78  
 Hallel 4, 44—46, 113, 114  
 Hebrew 10, 13—20, 41, 58, 70, 74  
 Hechaloth Rabbathi 54, 56, 63  
 Honorific Insertions 18  
 Ithpaal 28, 29, 58—60, 65, 67, 84  
 Jahrzeit 106  
 Kaddish, Bibliography VIII—X  
 Kaddish, Burial, the 32, 79—89, 97—100, 108, 115—117

Kaddish, Commentaries VIII  
   Hebrew 10, 18—20, 58, 70, 76  
   Language of 10—20  
   Liturgical 10, 51, 66, 70, 71, 76, 107—111  
   Mourning, the 10, 80, 97, 101—106, 107, 108, 115—117  
   Mysticism in 10, 54—57, 102, 108, 109  
   Name of 10, 19, 21, 100  
   Origin of 8—10, 21—24  
   Parodies of 10  
   Poems on 10, 67, 81, 107  
   Punctuation of 24—26, 28  
   Rabbinical 89—96, 108  
   Responses 8, 9, 19, 42—52, 60, 66, 73, 101—105, 109—111  
   Style of 27, 54  
 Kedusha 8, 21, 32, 78, 101  
 Kōtlan forms 37, 62  
 Liturgy, Fast Day 16, 46, 81, 84, 107, 108, 117  
   Kaddish in 10, 51, 66, 70, 71, 76, 107—111  
   Origin of 1  
   Psalm CXLV in 113  
   Psalms in 4, 44—46, 112, 113  
 Lord's Prayer. See Paternoster.  
*Malkemu Eloheanu* 10, 36, 39, 40, 81  
 Masora 6, 29  
 Masora to Onkelos 31, 37, 40, 68, 88  
 Messianism VII 6, 7, 9, 27, 29, 33, 34, 36, 38—40, 63, 64, 80—84, 97  
 Mourning Kaddish 10, 80, 97, 101—106, 107, 108, 115—117



- Mourning, Year of 105  
 Mysticism 10, 54-57, 102, 108, 109
- Name of God 26, 29-31, 33, 43, 45-51, 68, 72, 88, 96
- Parallelism 45, 112  
 Paternoster 21-23, 27, 28, 48, 49, 67, 110-112  
 Peace endings 71-73, 76  
 Peace greetings 70, 76  
 Prayer, Aramaic 12, 13  
   Attitude for 4, 76, 109  
   Times of 4, 7, 80  
 Prayers 1-4, 7, 12-16, 18, 80, 90  
   Expansion of 19, 54, 67, 70, 73, 80, 81, 90  
   Form of 2, 26, 41, 56, 67, 107  
 Psalm LI 20, 83  
   CXV 114  
   CXLV 113  
   doxologies 46  
   recitation 44, 45, 71, 112-115  
 Psalms, liturgical 4, 44-46, 112, 113  
 Punctuation 24-26, 28
- Rabbinical Kaddish 89-96, 108
- Responses 8, 9, 19, 42-52, 60, 66, 73, 101-105, 109-111  
 Resurrection 63, 80, 82, 116  
 Rituals IX, 24, 26, 52, 54, 65, 69, 75, 79, 89, 97
- Samaritan 23, 31, 53, 66  
*Shema'* 1, 14, 15, 44, 45  
*Shemone 'Esre* 1, 3, 14, 37, 43, 55, 66, 73, 76, 81, 84, 107, 109, 110  
*Shemone 'Esre*, Targum to 77, 83, 88, 89  
 Son, Importance of a 102-106  
 Suffixes 25, 29, 40, 41, 65, 68, 89, 92-95  
 Synagogue 1, 4, 11, 13, 46, 66, 107  
 Synonyms 15, 27, 54-56, 68, 89, 96, 100
- Targum 4, 9, 11-15, 29-33, 36-41, 48, 49, 53, 58, 61-63, 65, 67, 68, 75, 82, 84-89, 93, 96, 100  
 Targum, Masora to 31, 37, 40, 68, 88  
 Targum to *Shemone 'Esre* 77, 83, 88, 99  
 Temple 1, 4, 13, 21, 46, 87
- Woes, Messianic 40, 97  
 Women 12, 104-106, 114
- Yekūm Purkān* 13, 42, 90-92, 99

## INDEX OF SELECTED PASSAGES.

### A. OLD TESTAMENT.

Lev 26 <sub>25</sub> f.: 99	113 <sub>1</sub> f.: 45, 46; 115 <sub>9-18</sub> : 114; 118: 44;
II Sam 24 <sub>13</sub> : 98	125, 128, f. 134 <sub>3</sub> : 71; 145 <sub>21</sub> : 46
I Kings 8 <sub>23</sub> : 2, 3; 8 <sub>33, 35, 37</sub> : 98; 10 <sub>9</sub> : 45; 18 <sub>36</sub> : 2	Job 1 <sub>21</sub> : 45
II Kings 19 <sub>5</sub> : 2	Esth 4 <sub>8</sub> : 96
Isa 30 <sub>27</sub> : 30	Dan 2 <sub>20</sub> : 27, 45, 46; 2 <sub>19-23</sub> : 2; 3 <sub>31</sub> : 72;
Jer 14 <sub>12</sub> 21 <sub>7-9</sub> 24 <sub>10</sub> 27 <sub>8</sub> 29 <sub>17</sub> f.: 98;	3 <sub>32</sub> f.: 99; 4 <sub>1</sub> : 87; 4 <sub>23</sub> : 72; 4 <sub>26</sub> : 87;
32 <sub>17</sub> : 2; 32 <sub>24, 36</sub> 34 <sub>17</sub> 38 <sub>2</sub> : 98; 39 <sub>8</sub> : 4;	4 <sub>31</sub> : 72; 4 <sub>34</sub> : 56; 5 <sub>3-5</sub> 6 <sub>19</sub> : 87; 6 <sub>26</sub> : 72; 8 <sub>17, 19</sub> : 38; 9 <sub>4</sub> : 3; 9 <sub>21</sub> : 4; 9 <sub>26</sub> :
42 <sub>17, 22</sub> 44 <sub>13</sub> : 98	11 <sub>27, 35, 40</sub> 12 <sub>4-6, 9, 13</sub> : 38; 11 <sub>36</sub> : 29
Ezek 5 <sub>12-17</sub> 6 <sub>11</sub> f. 7 <sub>15</sub> 12 <sub>16</sub> 14 <sub>21</sub> : 98;	Ezr 4 <sub>14</sub> 5 <sub>14</sub> f. 6 <sub>5</sub> : 87; 9 <sub>5</sub> : 4
21 <sub>30-34</sub> 35 <sub>5</sub> : 38; 38 <sub>23</sub> : 27	Neh 1 <sub>5</sub> : 2, 3; 8 <sub>8</sub> : 12; 9 <sub>5</sub> f.: 2, 44—46;
Amos 4 <sub>10</sub> : 98; 5 <sub>12-15</sub> : 4; 7 <sub>2</sub> : 27;	9 <sub>32</sub> : 3
8 <sub>2</sub> : 39	I Chr 16 <sub>36</sub> : 46; 21 <sub>12</sub> : 98; 29 <sub>10</sub> : 46;
Ps 41 <sub>14</sub> : 46; 51 <sub>20</sub> : 83; 54 <sub>3</sub> : 30; 72 <sub>19</sub> : 46; 74 <sub>8</sub> : 4; 89 <sub>53</sub> : 46; 106 <sub>48</sub> : 44, 46;	29 <sub>10-13</sub> : 2
	II Chr 6 <sub>14</sub> : 2, 3; 6 <sub>24, 26, 28</sub> : 98; 9 <sub>8</sub> : 45;
	20 <sub>5</sub> f.: 2; 20 <sub>9</sub> : 98

### B. NEW TESTAMENT.

Matth 4 <sub>23</sub> : 6; 5 <sub>35</sub> : 64; 5 <sub>45, 48</sub> : 69; 6 <sub>5</sub> : 21, 109; 6 <sub>9</sub> : 30, 69, 111; 6 <sub>10</sub> : 78, 111;	John 3 <sub>27</sub> : 72; 5 <sub>2</sub> : 95; 6 <sub>59</sub> : 6; 11 <sub>24</sub> : 63; 18 <sub>20</sub> : 6; 20 <sub>16</sub> : 95
9 <sub>35</sub> : 6; 10 <sub>22</sub> : 38; 10 <sub>28</sub> : 30; 13 <sub>39</sub> : 38;	Acts 3 <sub>1</sub> : 4; 3 <sub>19</sub> : 96; 4 <sub>13</sub> : 12; 5 <sub>41</sub> : 30;
13 <sub>54</sub> : 6; 19 <sub>28</sub> : 82; 21 <sub>1</sub> : 95; 21 <sub>25</sub> : 72;	9 <sub>20</sub> : 5; 10 <sub>2</sub> ff., 9, 30: 4; 13 <sub>5, 14</sub> ff., 27, 42,
24 <sub>3-6</sub> : 38; 24 <sub>6-9</sub> : 97; 24 <sub>13</sub> f.: 38;	44, 49: 6; 14 <sub>1</sub> : 6, 11; 15 <sub>21</sub> : 5; 15 <sub>33</sub> : 70; 16 <sub>13, 16</sub> : 4, 12; 17 <sub>1</sub> ff., 10: 6; 17 <sub>12</sub> :
26 <sub>2</sub> : 95; 26 <sub>38</sub> : 95; 27 <sub>33</sub> : 37	11; 17 <sub>17</sub> : 6; 17 <sub>24</sub> : 96; 18 <sub>4</sub> : 6, 11;
Mark 1 <sub>21-39</sub> : 6; 5 <sub>34</sub> : 70; 6 <sub>2</sub> : 6; 10 <sub>51</sub> : 95; 11 <sub>25</sub> : 109; 11 <sub>30</sub> : 72; 13 <sub>7-13</sub> : 38;	18 <sub>19, 26</sub> : 6; 19 <sub>8</sub> : 6
14 <sub>36</sub> : 13, 69; 14 <sub>61</sub> : 60; 15 <sub>34</sub> : 12	Romans 1 <sub>25</sub> : 48; 8 <sub>15</sub> : 69; 9 <sub>5</sub> : 48
Luke 1 <sub>15</sub> : 95; 2 <sub>14</sub> : 78; 4 <sub>15</sub> ff.: 6, 12; 4 <sub>32, 44</sub> : 6; 5 <sub>33</sub> : 21; 6 <sub>8</sub> : 6; 7 <sub>50</sub> : 70; 11 <sub>1</sub> : 21, 22;	I Cor 1 <sub>23</sub> : 11; 14 <sub>16</sub> : 42; 14 <sub>27</sub> f.: 6
11 <sub>2</sub> : 111; 12 <sub>5</sub> : 30; 13 <sub>10</sub> : 6; 18 <sub>11-13</sub> : 109;	II Peter 3 <sub>3</sub> : 82
20 <sub>1</sub> : 72; 20 <sub>35</sub> ff.: 82; 21 <sub>9</sub> : 38; 24 <sub>36</sub> : 70	III John 1 <sub>7</sub> : 30
	Revel. 20 <sub>8</sub> : 27; 20 <sub>11</sub> 21 <sub>1, 5</sub> : 82; 21 <sub>10</sub> : 84

# INDEX OF HEBREW AND ARAMAIC WORDS.

93	מן	31, 68	אבא רבשמיא
61, 88	מן	88	אלילא
41, 96	מרא שמיא וארעא	9, 42, 46, 60, 110	אמן
25, 87	נוכראי	41, 42, 77	אמרו
62—65, 84	נחמתא	15, 16, 27	אמת ויציב
5	סדרא	7, 27	אפמרתא
74	סליחה	67	בעותא
25, 61	עלא	33	ברא
25, 28, 32, 52, 53, 65, 85, 112	עלמא	46	ברכת השיר
93	עטק	63—65	ברכתא
84	עתיד	2, 3, 60	גבורה
40, 85	פרק	28	גנל
37, 96	פרקן	25, 32, 84, 86	ד
66, 67	צלוחא	52, 70, 94	היה
37, 63	צמה	86, 87	היכלא
10, 100	קדיש	59	הלל
68, 96	קדם	7	הפמרה
75	קהלא	49	זכר
29, 31, 48, 49, 60	קודשא בריך הוא	41	זמן
59, 60	קלס	84	חדת
38, 39	קץ	73, 85, 95	חיים
92	רבן	94	חסדא
28, 33—35, 112	רעות	98	חרבא
74	רפואה	40	יום
58	שבת	93	יתב
86	שכלל	28	יתגדל
70, 76, 94	שלמא	98—100	כפנא
29—31, 45, 88	שם	100	מותנא
25, 26, 29, 31, 69, 72, 88	שמיא	95	מוינא
93	תלמיד	33, 96	מימרא
61, 65	תשבחתא	35, 36	מלכות



263595

















U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C077044904

